

From: [Margaret Schankler](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: "Secure MI Vote" petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:47:21 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I am writing to urge you to delay approval of the "Secure MI Vote" ballot initiative petition because of the following misleading language:

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to ***increase participation*** by providing free photo identification to anyone needing to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections by amending Michigan Election code...(code section numbers listed)"

This proposed summary is highly misleading. The petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID, even if they are provided free of charge, serves to decrease participation. The current law allows those without photo ID to vote so long as they sign an affidavit swearing, under penalty of law, that they are who they say they are. There is zero evidence that the affidavit provision has enabled a single fraudulent vote.

Please send this back to the petitioners to change the language so that the public is not misled.

Margaret Schankler
Michigan Voter

From: [Diana Raimi](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Citizen comments on Secure MI Vote Ballot proposal petition summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:14:08 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

TO: Board of State Canvassers

FROM: Diana Raimi, 4930 Hobbiton Lane, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

RE: Comments on the Summary Statement on the Statewide Ballot Proposal
Sponsored by Secure MI Vote

The summary statement is inaccurate and misleading.

It fails to warn that the proposed language will not be subject to vote of citizens but rather, if adopted by the legislature, will automatically become a veto-proof law.

It claims to “protect the right to vote” but in fact proposes new restrictions making it harder to vote. An accurate statement would specify that this proposal

- Adds new ID requirements calling for voters to present ID when voting, even though they have already provided that ID when they initially registered to vote, and eliminating the affidavit options that current law allows as a convenient and reasonable alternative.
- Adds new ID requirements for voters applying for absentee ballots, and eliminates the alternative of signing an affidavit, which current law allows as a convenient and reasonable alternative.
- Places new heavy burdens on elections clerks by barring non-governmental funding of many aspects of elections that have in the past been assisted by (non-partisan) donors.

It claims to prohibit “special interest funding of elections” when in fact it prohibits ALL assistance from anyone other than governmental entities:

- It bars assistance from all of the non-partisan donors or groups who have in the past provided locations for voting or ballot boxes, helped recruit election inspectors, helped bear the cost of prepaid postage, tabulation machines, drop boxes, or other voting needs, bought water or refreshments for election workers, etc.

It claims to “increase participation” when in fact its new requirements will undoubtedly reduce participation for all the above reasons.

It claims to “increase confidence” and “increase participation” when it will reduce confidence and participation by requiring forms of identification (such as last 4 digits of social security numbers) that many voters find intrusive and subject to risk of identity theft.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Diana Raimi

From: [Desirae Simmons](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comment about "Secure MI Vote" Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:32:18 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Hello Board of Canvassers,

This proposed summary is highly misleading. The petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID, even if they are provided free of charge, serves to decrease participation. The petition also creates other barriers such as forbidding anyone to send out absentee ballot applications unless the voter requests it. Requests must include a state ID number. A better way to describe it in a summary that would make sense to the everyday person reading it would be:

"An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots."

Thank you for helping to support democracy by keeping the language on petitions accurate and fair, and not barely cloaked partisan commentary.
Desirae Simmons

--

Desirae Simmons
She/They

From: [J.Tucker](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comment of Secure MI Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:35:22 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

To Whom It May Concern,

I'd like to provide comment on the Secure MI petition summary. The summary is extremely misleading & inaccurate - to the point that it seems to be purposefully deceptive.

Here is the current proposed summary:

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections by amending Michigan Election code...(code section numbers listed)"

The proposed legislation does not protect the right the vote. It makes it more likely that voters will be disenfranchised.

The proposed legislation won't increase confidence in the conduct of our elections. It doesn't address anything that has been identified as a risk to our elections.

We already have the option to provide identification when voting. The vast majority of voters do it. We already show ID as method to get on the voter registration rolls. Most probably re-register through their drivers license.

There's been numerous studies that show that voter ID laws do very little to improve election integrity, they due put up unnecessary barriers, they do result in decreases in participation (particularly minorities, young people & poor people), and the cost millions of dollars to implement.

An accurate summary would address the number of people that currently don't show ID to vote (there should be stats on how many voters sign affidavits) & explain how many millions of dollars it will cost.

Also the sentence that says to increase participation free idea will be provided - since the net impact of requiring ID is more likely to decrease participation that phrasing should be removed. It's a false representation of what the purpose is.

Additionally this bill has several provisions that exist to make it harder to vote by mail & to undue the rights to provided by the proposal we voted on several years ago. There's nothing in that summary that acknowledges how vote by mail will be changed & that it puts undo burden on voters.

The purpose of this bill is very clearly to make voting harder. It puts more hoops in place for all voters. The purpose is clearly to try to decrease voter participation.

The summary should clearly address how this will make voting harder for all voters.

The petition also creates other barriers such as forbidding anyone to send out absentee ballot applications unless the voter requests it. That's ridiculous. The only logical reason is to decrease participation.

Thank-you for your consideration. Please ensure that the summary is updated to accurately reflect the purpose (making voting harder/disenfranchising voters), to remove the misrepresentation that this will make elections more secure, to make it clear how it will be harder for people to vote, and to include an estimate of the millions of dollars

required to implement voter ID.

Thanks,

Jessica Tucker

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mary Kate Goodwin-Kelly](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comment on Proposed Petition Summary
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 10:27:33 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers,

I'm writing to comment on the petition summary proposed by Secure MI Vote, which reads, in part:

An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections, by amending Michigan Election Code sections 495, 523, 759, 759a, 759b, 761, 761b, 764b, and 813 (MCL 168.495, MCL 168.523, MCL 168.759, MCL 168.759a, MCL 168.759b, MCL 168.671, MCL 168.761b, MCL 168.764b, and MCL 168.813) and adding sections 523b (MCL 168.523b) 760a (MCL 168.760a) and 946 (MCL 168.946).

I am exceedingly concerned that the submitted summary would mislead signers. The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity." And it doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.

Additionally, the summary does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this. Notably, signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters. This is alarming.

I believe the current summary would mislead people who are trying to decide whether or not to sign it.

Thanks for your consideration of my concerns.
Sincerely,
Mary Kate Goodwin-Kelly
1546 Spruce Drive

Kalamazoo, MI 49008

From: [A Jackson](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: comment on Secure MI Vote petition summary
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:57:19 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers,

I wish to comment on the current Secure MI Vote petition summary "An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase the confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections, by amending Michigan Election Code sections 495, 523, 759, 759a, 759b, 761, 761b, 764b, and 813 (MCL 168.495, MCL 168.523, MCP 168.759, MCL 168.759a, MCL 168.759b, MCL 168.761, MCL 168.761b, MCL 168.764b, and MCL 168.813) and adding sections 523b (MCL 168.523b) 760a (MCL 168.760a) and 946 (MCL 168.946)."

The submitted summary language is, in my opinion, misleading and omits several points that potential signers should be aware of.

The petition does nothing to **'protect the right to vote'**. Registered voters always have the right to vote. This phrase is meant to create prejudice for the proposal.

The petition does not specify how **'providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote'** would be made available to any voter who would need such identification. How would such an individual - perhaps an elderly immobile person - who doesn't own a driver's license or other photo ID actually obtain such an ID? The burden is placed on each individual voter to ensure they have valid photo ID, and the summary language should state this clearly.

The petition does NOT **'protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections'**. Clerks are currently cash-strapped. Donations from civic-minded individuals and organizations have always supported clerks and election workers on election day. This includes churches donating polling space and people baking cookies for the poll workers. Prohibiting outside donations to help elections run more smoothly will not 'protect election integrity'. The summary should be more clear regarding what 'special interest funding' means.

The summary fails to mention that voters applying for absentee ballots through the mail **will need to supply either their driver's license number, official Michigan personal identification card number, or the last four digits of their social security number through the mail.**

The summary also fails to mention that **election officials cannot send absentee ballot applications unless formally requested.**

Finally, the summary does not explain **that this is NOT a ballot initiative.** Most petition

signers assume they are signing for an issue that will be voted on by the people of Michigan and are unaware this initiative would be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from a not necessarily representative proportion (3.4%) of Michigan's population .

Sincerely,
Anne Jackson

From: [Jan Baumgras](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Cc: [Jan Baumgras](#)
Subject: Comment on Secure MI Vote Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:32:27 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I ask the State Board of Canvassers to reject the summary of the Secure MI Vote Petition. Voters need to be fully informed of everything the petition would do before signing, and this summary does not mention all the key points, many of which I believe would be objectionable to most voters.

1. Requiring voters to provide the last four digits of their Social Security number both when registering to vote and when applying for an absentee ballot is not mentioned in the summary. A large number of election workers would have access to this information, so I believe many voters including me would oppose this requirement and would refuse to sign a petition if they were informed. Therefore, I believe this must be included for the summary to adequately inform those being asked to sign.
2. The summary does not mention the allocation of taxpayer dollars to pay for free IDs. Again, I believe many voters would oppose this, so this must be included for the summary to adequately inform those being asked to sign.
3. The summary begins claiming that the proposal would protect the right to vote. I suggest that the Board strike this statement disingenuous. I can't find anything in this initiative that protects voters and quite a bit that would make it more difficult for quite a few qualified voters to vote. For example, most of us know older people who no longer drive and allowed their licenses to expire. Do we really think their right to vote is protected by requiring them to find a ride to the Secretary of State to get a new ID? As the Board is undoubtedly aware, many respected organizations known for promoting the right to vote oppose this initiative for this reason.
4. The summary also begins with claiming that the initiative would increase confidence in the election process. I suggest that the Board also strike this statement. This is way beyond disingenuous. Again as the Board is undoubtedly aware, this petition is initiated by the Republican Party, the same group that spent months after the 2020 election making unsupported and outright false claims that the election was "rigged" and fraudulent. Now they want the public to believe that their intent is to increase the very confidence they themselves undermined.

Those are the reasons I ask the Board to reject their proposed summary.

I would also like the Board to know that I oppose allowing the initiative to be circulated if you can do so within the parameters of your responsibilities. In addition to the 4 reasons above, I have at least two more concerns.

1. The Republican Party has stated publicly that they do not intend to place this initiative on the ballot. Instead, they intend to gather the signatures then pass the proposal themselves, thus enacting a law with that has been supported only by a small percentage of voters. Their intent is clearly to bypass the governor, but in so doing they also bypass the majority of voters. The state Constitution allows the legislature to enact an initiative, but was the intent of this provision to allow a small minority to impose law? I doubt it. I believe the intent was to allow the legislature to enact a law that would likely be passed by the voters anyway without the effort and expense of placing a proposal on the ballot. They've abused this provision at least twice before to enact a law that might have been defeated as a ballot initiative, and if it is within the power of the Board to prevent another abuse, please do so.
2. Even more heinous, I believe the initiative includes a poison pill clause that would make it difficult for the people to undo this once passed by the legislation no matter how many oppose it.
3. Neither the summary nor the initiative itself recognize that the fee is already waived for large numbers of people. The proposed provision might broaden the number who qualify a bit, but I don't believe that this provision needs to be in a ballot initiative. I'm confident that if Republican legislatures want to pass this part that their Democratic counterparts in the legislature would vote in favor, and the governor would sign.

I would like the Board to know that I agree that if it were equally easy for all citizens to obtain a state ID, I would be in favor of requiring ID both when registering to vote and when voting. I don't believe that signature matching is a great way to verify that a voter is who he/she claims to be. However, it is not equally easy for every qualified voter to obtain a state, and investigations have shown that fraud attempts are very rare. Our clerks are doing a difficult job well and do not need the additional burdens this law would place on them. I also believe there are acceptable alternatives to using Social Security numbers. If I believed this initiative would be accurately presented to the people along with pro and con arguments then I'd be OK with it going on the ballot. Sadly, that is not what will happen, so I ask the Board to do what it can to ensure that the Constitution election provisions not be abused again.

Jan Baumgras

From: [Lori Boyce](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: comment regarding petition submitted by Secure Mi Vote
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 10:32:45 AM
Attachments: [Michigan Board of Canvassers repetition by security MI vote.docx](#)

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Please consider my comments as included in the attached letter.

Bottom line – I find the summary language extremely misleading and the letter indicates why and supports with comments on the specific legislative language proposed.

Thank you

Lori Boyce

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Michigan Board of Canvassers
via Email: MDOS-Canvassers@Michigan.gov

Re: Ballot proposal by Secure MI Vote

Dear Board Members:

I have read through the summary language and proposed changes to Michigan election law and would like to provide feedback as well as strong objections.

Summary Language

To not be misleading, the summary language should be revised to indicate that the proposals would:

Increase the cost of election administration and restrict the sources of funding of elections to only those appropriated by the state legislature, which could make it difficult or impossible for some clerks to administer an election. Such funding restrictions would also relate to in-kind donations as well as the donation of facilities for in-person voting or absentee ballot counting, including from schools, churches and the like. Further, that the proposal would make it more burdensome for voters to vote, particularly the poor, those with disabilities, students, and some elderly people.

Additionally, no state department or employee (including state colleges or universities) or any county, city or township could send an absentee voter application without a specific request from the voter. However, there is no such ban by partisan organizations that could try to unduly influence the prospective voter with propaganda. Thus, **the language in the summary should say that only partisan organizations can send or provide access to an absentee voter application without the voter asking for one and that the SOS, clerks and public colleges and universities would be prohibited from doing so, including online. Further, the election officials would be prohibited from countering misinformation about how to participate in the election.**

One might also argue that these proposals would significantly increase the possibility of identity theft for voters, particularly those voting absentee that must provide the last 4 digits of their social security number if they don't have a driver's license or state ID, and that significantly more people will have access to registered voters social security numbers. Thus, **the summary language should also indicate that these changes may significantly increase the chances of identity theft. It has been proven that identity thieves can steal your ID if they have these last four digits because the first sets of numbers pertain to your birth location and group (year born), all of which is easy to find out. The fact that the last four digits of your social security number are the most sensitive part of your social security number is WELL KNOWN.** This should NEVER be divulged or used to ID a person. There have been many articles on this over the years. It wasn't until 2011 that social security numbers became randomized. With the proposal, many more people will have access either illegally (such as stolen mail) or legally (through access to a data base with social security numbers or in receipt of absentee ballot applications in the course of their work).

Arguably, adding additional voter ID's to make the election more secure does not. The types of additional ID proposed is easily obtained by a family member or a professional service provider (such as

a tax preparer). Thus, the summary language should indicate that **the additional forms of ID may not prevent a family member or close friend from applying for an absentee ballot on their behalf.**

Specific legislative wording

1. Section 523B regarding voter access fund
 - a. The new voter access fund is to be funded solely by the state legislature through allocation. The proposed initial allocation of only \$3M for fiscal year ending 9/30/22 seems woefully inadequate to support elections particularly with the extra burden being imposed on clerks:
 - i. to check additional forms of ID,
 - ii. to hire additional staff to send out absentee ballot applications individually versus a much more efficient mailing to all registered voters,
 - iii. to hire additional staff to respond to more individual calls for information since another part of the proposal is to prohibit funds to be used for election education etc. (see below).
 - b. Voter ID fee only waived if the person claims hardship. Further, there is no relief for voters who incur cost (and effort) to obtain other documents that need to be obtained in order to apply for a voter ID. Some of these documents may have been lost due to flooding, fires, homelessness etc. over the years since registering to vote.
 - c. No outside funding for election equipment or administration. An exception should be made, at a minimum, for contributions from 501(c)(3) organizations and for donations of facilities (including by schools, churches etc. that are currently used for in-person voting). Otherwise, the legislature, through lack of funding, could make it impossible for poorer communities to pay for election administration, facilities and equipment.
 - d. How would the voter access funds be allocated? Can it be allocated such that only communities that are of the political party that is the majority of the legislature or secretary of state, for example, get funding and then other communities have no ability to get funds elsewhere to actually administer their elections? This certainly would be very detrimental to poorer communities that must obtain supplemental funding in order to administer their elections properly.
2. Section 759.(1) regarding sending or providing access to an absentee voter application ballot
 - a. The language should define what providing access to an absentee voter application ballot means as this could be broadly construed as prohibiting the SOS, clerk's etc. from providing the application online for a registered voter to download and print.
 - b. If there is a prohibition for any state agency, political subdivision or employee of the state to provide an application for an absentee ballot without the voter requesting, there should be an outright prohibition for any other entity to provide the application or access to such application as well. Election officials have a fiduciary obligation to run an election without bias; partisan groups do not.
 - c. What accommodations are to be made for those that cannot pick up an application for an absentee ballot, e.g the elderly, those with disabilities, those without transportation (including students). How would such accommodation be funded?
 - d. Sending out an absentee ballot application to all registered voters is much more efficient than sending out one by one. Further, sending out applications to all registered voters helps to keep the voter rolls up to date as returned applications (i.e. not

deliverable) will help update the poll books for changes in address not otherwise reported, of deaths etc. This is a highly efficient means of keeping the voter rolls up to date, which does assist with election security.

3. Section 759.(4)
 - a. Acceptable forms of ID under the proposed legislation include a student ID, or tribal ID, or passport. Yet, these types of ID are required to be presented in person in order to obtain an absentee ballot application, thus discriminating against students, tribal members. For example, many college students are prohibited from having a vehicle on campus, tribal members may be more remote from the clerk's office, etc. The proposed language should include that a copy of a student ID, tribal ID, or passport in the types of ID that can be provided with an application that is mailed in. Many people are uncomfortable providing any part of their social security number (and rightfully so).
 - b. The same should be adjusted in the sample language provided for absentee ballot applications.
 - c. Further, the absent voter application does not inform the applicant of the alternative types of identification that can be provided. It should.
 - d. Requiring additional forms of identification does add additional steps that are likely to have more voters make errors that will need to be corrected through an additional trip to the clerk's office which is not practical for many segments of the population that cannot physically visit the clerk's office or do not have the transportation or money to do so or that can't take time off of work to visit the clerk's office during limited work day hours.
4. Section 759(a) – regarding absent uniformed services or overseas citizens
 - a. The provision of a copy of a military ID or passport should be added to each relevant section as these are acceptable forms of ID and these individuals, by virtue of being in the military or overseas are not in a position to provide such identification in person but could provide copies electronically, assuming access to a scanner (which may not be feasible, particularly for military personnel).
5. Section 760A (new) requires that each county, city, township clerk have access to the state data base that includes drivers license numbers, state id numbers and last four digits of social security numbers as well as the voter signature.
 - a. That is a lot of people who will now have access to personally identifiable information – which presents additional security risks for every registered voter in the state (perhaps non-registered voters as well.)
6. Concerns with language added to Section 761
 - a. To provide that it is a misdemeanor for a voter to make a false statement on an absentee ballot and a FELONY for anyone who assists the absentee voter. But the statement that is being attested to also says that they didn't show the ballot to anyone else.
 - b. Added that the only people that can legally be in possession of an absentee ballot are the voter's immediate family, someone who resides in the same household, people whose job it is to transport mail before it gets to a US postal worker, express mail

delivery service etc. Anyone not listed who handles the voter's ballot is guilty of a felony.

- i. What about caregivers? People in nursing homes who can't put their own ballot in the post will be at a disadvantage or put the people who care for them at risk of being charged with a felony. What is wrong with one student driving to the an absentee ballot box to drop off ballots for a group of friends so that not all have to get transportation to the ballot box? Why does it matter who it is as long as they have been asked by the voter to deliver it to the clerk or the mail for them perhaps due to an ongoing personal relationship?
 - ii. Spouses often work on ballots together. Need to either remove the language that says they didn't show the ballot to anyone else or eliminate the misdemeanor / felony charges.
7. Added to section 764b is requirement for ALL absentee ballots to be delivered to the clerk's office OR a valid absentee ballot drop box by 8 pm on day of election. Further, the clerk's office only needs to be open 9 to 5 for the 5 business days before an election.
 - i. So, is there a requirement that each clerk have at least one absentee ballot drop box? If not, this is really burdensome for people that don't trust the mail and want to drop off their ballots. Many people work during the hours of 9 to 5. Voting should not be so hard. The language should be modified to require absentee ballot drop boxes in a ratio that is proportionate to the registered voters and include at least one at the local clerk's offices. Further, each drop box should be open for a minimum of 10 days before the election, 24 hours a day, and until the polls close at 8 pm on election day.
 - ii. Given the delay in mail delivery in recent times, those absentee ballots that are postmarked by say 3 days before the election should be counted regardless of when received by the clerk's office. In this way, no voter shall be disenfranchised simply because the US Postal Service did not deliver mail timely (which could be simply due to slowness of mail, or because one or more US Postal Service employees tried to rig the election by not timely delivering mail that tends to lean towards a different political party than that employee. If this group is really about election security, this addition should not be a problem.
8. Section 813 was changed to require that validated provisional ballots be tabulated by the County board of canvassers and NOT the city or township clerk and within 7 days of the election. (Remember, voters have 6 days to complete their identification process).
 - i. First, the tabulating machines at the city/ township level are set up to handle the tabulation of very local elections that would require additional tabulating capabilities at the county level.
 - ii. Second, does the county board of canvassers already have the tabulation machines and personnel needed to handle this task, or will they have to purchase (and store) such equipment and hire workers?
 - iii. I would suggest that this provision be modified to allow the city or township clerk to process such ballots.
9. Added section 946 regarding funding of elections
 - a. Prohibits any funding of elections or election related activity, by anyone other than funds from the state legislature or from the county, city or township funds. Each are

prohibited from accepting any private funds or any in-kind contributions, either direct or indirect.

- b. Election related activities include: voter registration, voter verification review, sharing of voter information, review of election materials, mailing of election materials, creation or dissemination of advertising about an election, recruiting and hiring of precinct election inspectors, as well as election related equipment (which is broadly defined and even includes signage for the precinct, and facilities to have the election held), etc.
- c. Prohibits receipt of election funding from any component of the state --- that would include state colleges and universities and public schools.
 - 1. Frankly – I find this whole section outrageous. They are proposing to substantially increase the workload to conduct elections, while at the same time restricting funding and the donation of space to hold in-person elections or to count absentee ballots. What is to say that a Republican legislature withholds funds to conduct elections in certain parts of the state while at the same time prohibiting the election officials from getting funds elsewhere?
 - 2. In the last election, there was a request of a wide range of non-profits (I was on the zoom call so I speak from experience) to explain the extra costs of having an election during COVID, the need for additional tabulating machines due to an expectation that there would be far more people voting absentee (combination of new no reason absentee voting and COVID), etc. Many non-profits came forward and provided funding for elections. Typically, the funds were targeted to the communities most in need of the funds, regardless of predominance of one political party or the other.
 - 3. Cities are strapped for funds as it is – why not allow contributions to generally facilitate an election. The clerks still determine how the election is conducted.
 - 4. Why can't election officials have funds to help promote registering to vote, advertise elections and issues on the ballots etc.?
 - 5. Is putting voter registration information, absentee ballot applications etc. on a website considered "advertising"?
 - 6. Why can't state colleges and universities encourage their students to vote without having to get money appropriated from the state legislature?
 - 7. This prohibition on funding seems to be all about having a stealth election (at least from non-partisan election officials and the state departments/ universities), and to disadvantage poorer communities from having the funds or facilities necessary to facilitate voting by their constituents, and for universities for encouraging their students to participate in elections.
 - 8. Why should partisan organizations be able to communicate regarding absentee voting applications etc. and the people responsible for the election not be able to?
- 10. There is inconsistency throughout the various sections in that in some cases villages are listed along with cities and townships and in most cases village are not. This wording should be modified to be consistent throughout the various sections.

11. In section 523 “elector” was changed to “individual” but that is not the terminology used elsewhere. The same term should be used for a voter throughout the various sections.

Frankly, the summary of the proposal needs to be quite clear that the bill is not about a more secure election, but rather an election that is harder to participate in, particularly if you are a student, tribal member, poor, a person with disabilities, or without access to transportation, that the voter ID requirements will significantly increase the risk of identity theft, and that the proposals create a new opportunity for partisan rigging of an election by limiting the funding that may be available for administering an election, securing facilities, and restricting election officials from both providing accurate information as well as counteracting misinformation that may arise.

I will be out of the country when you will likely schedule a hearing on these proposals, otherwise, I would have also been there in person (or zoom).

Thank you for your consideration.

Lori Boyce
21699 Sheffield Dr.
Farmington Hills, MI 48335

From: [Glenden H](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Comments on 100-word summary of "Secure MI Vote" petition
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 4:09:25 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Good afternoon,

I would like to submit a comment on the 100-word summary of the Secure MI Vote petition.

The legislation initiated by the passing of this petition does not "protect the right to vote," "increase confidence in the conduct of elections," or "protect election integrity." It also does not prohibit "special interest" funding - it only prohibits all **private** funding, including local and nonpartisan community groups who may want to do something as innocuous as providing snacks/drinks for hungry/thirsty election workers. Will the people gathering signatures on this petition be addressing any of these points when soliciting for signatures out in the field? Will they also explain that this is not a petition to put the legislation on a ballot for all Michiganders to weigh in on, but rather a way of circumventing the vote - and doesn't that seem a little backwards to allege to be a champion for "election integrity" by circumventing a vote on the matter and/or ignoring a recent vote? Michiganders already voted on additional election securities and abolishing gerrymandering and we overwhelmingly voted no and yes, respectively.

Thank you for your time,
Glenden Hess
Midland City, Ward 04, Precinct 005

E: glendenhess@gmail.com
C: 989-615-4846

From: [C. Tucker](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comments on Proposed Pediton "Secure MI"
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:40:37 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

The proposed summary is highly inaccurate and misleading. The measures would not "protect the right to vote". Further, it creates barriers to voting.

The proposal does not adequately fund "a free photo identification". (NOTE it cost Indiana, a much smaller state, \$10M to provide voter id.) So again highly misleading and down right deceitful to suggest that the voters are getting free ID. The proposal limits the ability of Clerks to provide absentee ballots and that information is not clearly communicated in the summary

The summary needs to clearly state that" This initiative limits the ability of of city clerks and other government officials from sending applications for absentee ballots"

Constance M Tucker
2515 Fred St
Warren, Michigan

From: [CHRISTINE ALLEN](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comments on Summary of Ballot Proposal for SecureMIVote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:15:00 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Board of Canvassers,

As you review for approval the summary language before you, please consider the impact of the confusing and mis-leading comments:

* "to protect the right to vote" There is nothing in this ballot proposal that protects the right to vote for anyone. How can increasing restrictions increase the right to vote? I think this phrase in the summary is misleading and untrue.

* "to increase participation by providing free photo identification" This is also untrue. The fund that is suggested by the ballot proposal would cover the cost of the piece of plastic only. It would not cover the fees and money necessary to get the required documents such as birth certificate. It does not cover the cost that is associated with the travel to places where the birth certificate may be, nor the travel to the Secretary of States office for an appointment to get the "free ID". How can they say in the summary that it's free if there are additional costs? How is this supposed to increase participation? I find this a very misleading statement in the summary.

* "to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding" This is also misleading as the ballot proposal calls for NO outside funding by any groups including non-partisan organizations that may donate or offer at a reduced cost a precinct location (church or school). This is also misleading as it insinuates that all outside funds influence the election process; where I am a poll worker, the pastor regularly makes a pot of coffee for the workers and offers water and chips. The wording of the ballot proposal summary indicates that simple outside support is all for influence. I understand the hard work that you put into these evaluations and I appreciate your time and the opportunity to comment on the summary statement.

Regards,

Christine Allen

Beverly Hills, MI

From: [Zona Scheiner](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comments on summary statement STATEWIDE BALLOT PROPOSAL SPONSORED BY SECURE MI VOTE
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:35:48 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers

This email is to comment on the summary language for the above petition. I have a few concerns about it.

\1. The summary says that the petitioner's purpose is "to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot".

This implies that requiring photo identification is not currently a requirement is not true. Michigan law (MCL 168.523) currently requires a photo id before casting a vote. By implication, the language appears to be fixing something which is broken. On the contrary, it is already in existence. That is clearly misleading.

2. Content of a petition does not "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity." The summary is supposed to represent the petition not imply that it does something that of course voters would like

3. It does not eliminate special interest funding. It eliminates all private funding, including those which community members supply snacks, water, etc. By stating special interest it creates a bias. Who would be against that but it is not what is in the petition.

4. The summary does not mention that election officials would be prohibited to send absentee ballot applications if not specifically asked for.

5. The petition does not say that the legislature could adopt this change to election law simply by having 3.4% of the population sign the petition. It does not have to go to the voters or to the Governor.

6. What is not included are other changes such as no longer being able to submit an affidavit if you do not have a photo ID; it would have to be a provisional ballot. People would need to return to the office and the Secretary of State may or may not accept it.

7. It does not say that the populace would be required to give out sensitive information such as drivers license and last four digits of social security numbers to clerks in the Election Office. This is dangerous in terms of any identity theft.

I humbly request that the Board of Canvassers either insist upon or write a summary statement that is an accurate reflection of the petition. Many people rely on the 100 words to determine whether to sign. This language will not clarify but rather obfuscate.

Thank you

Zona Scheiner,

4131 Thornoaks Dr
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
734 646 9353

From: [Rachel Pooley](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comments re "Secure MI" Petition Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:23:08 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To the Board of Canvassers of MI
Re: "Secure MI" Petition Summary
Sept 9, 2021

The current proposed summary of this petition is:

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections by amending Michigan Election code...(code section numbers listed)"

The current proposed summary is highly misleading. The petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID, even if they are provided free of charge, serves to decrease participation. The petition also creates other barriers such as forbidding anyone to send out absentee ballot applications unless the voter requests it.

I suggest this as a summary:

An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots.

Thank you for your consideration.
Rachel Pooley
1246 Kensington Dr
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Cilla Tomas](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Comments to Petition by "Secure MI Vote"
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:28:40 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

1. The Petition fails to indicate that this is **not a ballot initiative but if only 3.4 % of the Michigan Population sign it and the legislature approves it, it will become law without the Michigan population voting on it.**
 2. The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity." It actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups and churches who offer their space for voting or provide snacks for election workers. They need to be more specific, what organization and what they mean by private organizations providing funding.
 2. The summary fails to mention that voters applying for absentee ballots through the mail **will need to supply either their driver's license number, official Michigan personal identification card number, or the last four digits of their social security number through the mail.** To provide the last four digits of the Social Security Number by mail is risky because of fraud, somebody could get a hold of the whole Social Security Number even if you only provide the last four digit.
 3. Waiving fees for a state ID is nice, but it doesn't help people get other documents they need or to get to a Social Security State appointment. Even if people have a birth certificate somewhere (and not everyone born at home does, especially poor blacks), they need to know how to get a certified copy and pay fees. Getting an older person who uses a wheelchair while living in an assisted living home to a Social Security State appointment to get a new ID because she or he let her license expire when she quit driving can be an onerous burden.
- .Thank you for taking my comments into consideration!

Cilla Tomas
1408 Orkney Dr.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
734-995-0962

From: [David Solomon](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Concerns about Secure MI Vote petitionl summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:43:29 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers,

I believe the summary contained within the petition Secure MI Vote submitted for review dated September 2, 2021 does not accurately reflect the proposed changes to Michigan law in the petition and is in fact highly misleading.

1. The petition summary states the legislation protects the right to vote and increases confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot. This proposed changes to law eliminates the ability of a potential voter to use a signed affidavit attesting to their identity instead of an approved photo ID. This option was only used by 0.2% of the voters in the 2020 election and despite numerous audits, no significant fraud was found. Voters using this option for identification must affirm their identity and risk being charged with a felony with up to five years in prison if the information is not accurate. It is hard to see how this change in the law protects the right to vote or increases confidence in the conduct of elections.
2. The petition summary states "to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote" The proposed legislation creates a three million dollar fund to cover the \$10 fee for a State ID for people who cannot afford the \$10 fee. The Secretary of State (SOS) already has a program to waive this fee for anyone over 65, a veteran, homeless, or on State/Federal assistance. There are far greater costs and challenges to obtain a State ID for people who cannot afford the \$10 fee such as obtaining the required documentation including a certified birth certificate. With work, child care and lack of transportation, just getting to a SOS branch office to apply for a State ID is probably a greater challenge for someone who cannot afford the fee than the actual fee. The proposed fund for free State IDs would do virtually nothing to alleviate the challenges of eliminating the option of using a signed affidavit to document identity and would not increase voter participation in elections.
3. The summary also states the proposed changes to the law protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections. This is highly misleading. The change to the law would prohibit any nongovernmental group from donating money or providing any type of nonmonetary support for conducting elections. Nonprofits such as the Center for Tech and Civic Life provided grants to 465 Michigan cities, townships and counties to help cover the costs of administering the 2020 election with the challenges posed by the COVID epidemic. The only "special interest" these grants posed was making it easier for citizens eligible to be able to cast a ballot to be able to safely do so. By eliminating donations and other support from nonprofit organizations, this change in the law will increase costs for conducting elections and likely result in reducing polling sites and drop boxes for ballots making it more difficult for people to vote.

I strongly urge the Board of Canvassers to modify the summary to accurately reflect the proposed changes to Michigan election laws.

Sincerely,

David J Solomon, PhD

From: [Ingrid Gunderson](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Correct misleading summary SECURE MI
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:40:08 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Please make the description of petition informative rather than the current distortions presented:

An accurate summary:

An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials to applications for absentee ballots. "

From: [PJKTeacher](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#); Canvassers@michigan.gov
Subject: Fwd: "Secure MI" petition - poorly worded summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:55:24 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board Members:

This proposed summary in the "Secure MI" petition is very misleading. Adding additional requirements will lead to decreased participation. Requiring voters to request absentee ballot applications is another unnecessary step that is put up as a barrier in hopes of decreasing participation. There's a difference between automatically sending out absentee ballots vs absentee ballot applications.

A better summary would be: "An initiation of legislation that would require photo ID before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots."

Regards,
Pamela Knapp

From: [Niloufer Mackey](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Cc: [D S Mackey](#); [Christopher Rohwer](#)
Subject: Misleading summary: Secure MI Vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:33:00 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To: Board of Canvassers

Re: Misleading Summary for Secure MI Vote Petition

We are writing to express our deep concern about the misleading summary proposed for the Secure MI Vote petition by the group responsible for this petition. Here are some of the reasons:

1. The summary states that the petition will "protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification". We strongly feel that this claim is actually false. Photo ID is already required.
2. The summary also states that the petition will increase voter participation. This claim is also false, see item 3 below.
3. The summary omits any mention that the proposal prohibits election officials from sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested. This is not only misleading, but it will decrease rather than increase voter participation.
4. The summary also states that the petition prohibits special interest funding of elections. This is also misleading because the petition prohibits all private funding, including support from non-partisan groups who might want to provide emergency funds with no strings attached to county clerks offices.

Thank you.

Niloufer Mackey, 3013 Bobolink Lane, Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Steve Mackey, 3013 Bobolink Lane, Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Mary Lou Rohwer, 6024 Texas Drive, Kalamazoo, MI 49009To

From: [Robert Anderson](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: My comments on Summary by Secure MI Vote and my substitute Summary
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 3:37:57 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

September 8, 2021

**Michigan Department of State
EMAIL: MDOS-Canvassers@Michigan.gov**

VIA

Lansing, MI

Dear Department of State:

Please consider the following as my comments of Secure MI Vote's Summary. Also, I have attached a substitute Summary for your consideration.

1. Assessing the proposal's alleged purpose of protecting the right to vote by requiring photo identification before voting. This first alleged purpose, as stated, is deceptive and misleading since Michigan election law already contains a photo ID requirement when voting. The evidence obtained and presented by the Michigan Senate earlier this year proves that the current system identification in each of the steps in registering and voting already adequately protects the right to vote. As reported by the Senate, there was no evidence of any significant fraud in the 2020 election. Specifically, the Senate report found there was no evidence of any fraud in allowing a few thousand Michigan voters to offer an Affidavit instead of presenting a photo ID. In fact, the excessive photo ID requirements in the proposed legislation actually achieve the opposite of "protecting the right to vote" because the increased barriers of the proposal will discourage people from voting.

2. Assessing the proposal's alleged purpose of increasing the confidence in elections by requiring photo identification before voting. Note that the Summary's second alleged purpose is a separate idea from its first stated purpose in item 1. This second stated purpose is misleading because the proposal has an undisclosed ulterior purpose of making it harder for voters who either do not have a driver's license or a state-issued personal ID card to vote in-person. Moreover, the proposal's near-elimination of using an affidavit instead of showing a photo ID only when voting in-person affects a few thousand voters [a small fraction of 1% of the electorate]. Such a small impact on Michigan elections will not result in any significant boost in the public's overall confidence in elections. Further, all the official and well-researched evidence on election integrity in the 2020 election in our State—both by the Senate and in Court decisions—confirm that the election was fair, honest and well run, and most Michigan voters did have confidence in the 2020 election.

3. Assessing the proposal's alleged purpose of increasing participation by providing free photo identification to those who have none. The Summary's third stated purpose of increasing voter participation is misleading because it requires that the voters intended to be helped with free personal state ID cards must first be disenfranchised from voting. This is because this so-called free ID card idea is tied to the proposal's new strict identification rule mentioned above. Implementing the proposal's new strict identification leads to new barriers for the voting participation by those who neither have a driver's license nor a personal state ID card, and this results in a decline in their participation. Therefore, if the true intent of the proposal is to increase voter participation of those who have no photo ID cards, it is better not to disenfranchise them in the first place. Moreover, the administration of such a fund would create a new huge administrative burden on the Secretary of State. And administering the free access to personal state ID cards based on "hardship" would be fraught with subjectivity and ineffectiveness. In short, such a fund and allowing people with hardship to avoid paying the usual \$10 fee would not increase their voter participation.

4. Assessing the proposal's alleged purpose of protecting election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections. The summary's fourth stated purpose alleges that special interests help fund Michigan elections in 2020. This is a fallacy. It simply did not happen. Both Republican-area cities and townships as well as Democratic-area cities and townships received funds without bias or special interests at play in 2020. The outside financial help was critically needed to help cash-strapped clerks finance the increased costs of the elections due to COVID. Also, the use of the words "special interest" is slanted and violates subsection (b) of 482b(2)'s requirement that a purpose statement should refrain from being "impartial." The proposal is also not impartial in its total ban on even in-kind assistance which could result in prohibiting churches, YMCAs and other charities from serving as polling places.

5. The Summary's shotgun statutory references do not state adequate purposes, apprise the public nor convey common everyday meaning. The balance of the Secure MI Vote's Summary merely lists the citations to the various MCL sections that the proposal alters and lists MCL citations to the new sections the proposal adds. This shotgun approach is not what subsections (b), (c) and (d) of MCL 168. 482b(2) intended. Such an approach does not "state the purposes" of the proposal as subsection (b) requires. Such an approach does not "apprise the petition signer of the subject matter of the proposed amendment" since ordinary voters who are asked to sign a petition, such as on a street corner, cannot be expected to conduct exhaustive legal research on the spot in order to become adequately informed on whether or not to sign the petition. Nor does such an approach with legalistic MCL citations "have a common everyday meaning to the general public" as subsection (d) requires.

6. The Summary's shotgun statutory references violate the implied simplistic format of this kind of a Summary. MCL 168.482(3) requires that a Summary that proposes changes to the constitution must specifically reference the exact provisions of the constitution that would be "altered or abrogated." The fact that section 482(3) does not make this same specificity reference requirement to a Summary for legislative initiatives implies that the Legislature intended that this kind of Summary should be more simplistic and readable for the ordinary public. Therefore, the use of specific statutory cites to altered statutes in the Secure MI Vote's Summary violates section 482(3).

7. The Summary fails to disclose several other proposed law changes. Subsection

(b) of MCL 168.482b(2) requires that the Summary be a "true statement" of the proposal. Partial statements cannot be considered truthful. Secure MI Vote's Summary lacks truthfulness because it fails to mention 9 legislative changes it intends to make in its proposed legislation. The missing proposed changes include: 1) the new mandatory requirement to disclose the last 4 digits of one's social security number, 2) the new mandatory requirement that the application for in-person voting must contain additional affirmations, 3) a listing of specific identification documents that can be used when voting in-person, 4) prohibition on general mailings of applications for absentee voter ballots (AVB) by the SOS and election clerks, 5) increased disclosure of personal information on an application for an AVB application for all voters, specifically for overseas voters, voters in emergency health situations and voters seeking personal protection from abusers, 6) mandating access by clerks to voter's personal information possessed by the SOS, 7) providing more rules on how election clerks should conduct elections in the last week of elections, 8) creation of a deadline for when AVBs must be received in drop boxes, and 9) adds rules to how to tabulate votes.

The following is my substitute Summary which meets the 100-word limit.

Summary of Initiation of Legislation

This initiation of legislation mandates increased disclosures of personal information, such as partial social security numbers, for voter registration, voting in-person and applying for absentee ballots; expands affirmations and denies current right of signing affidavits when voting in person; details forms of acceptable identification; creates a \$3.0 million voter access fund for free state IDs; restricts access to absentee ballots by banning general mailing of applications; expands personal information disclosures for absentee ballot applications; increases clerk's access to personal voter data; regulates drop boxes and ballot tabulations; prohibits funding of elections from non-governmental sources.

Thank you for your consideration

Robert C. Anderson

Attorney at Law
Former Adjunct Professor NMU
Certified Elder Law Attorney
Georgetown University Law Center
810 W. Magnetic
Marquette, MI 49855
906-373-6047
rcanderson1148@gmail.com

Please note: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Review, use, distribution, or disclosure by anyone not an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender.

From: [Carrie Hatcher-Kay](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: NO on Secure MI Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:00:29 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Canvassers, Thank you for your hard work and service to our state.

The people of Michigan voted overwhelmingly in favor of Prop 3 for MORE access to voting in 2018. And in favor of Prop 2 which established your commission.

The "Secure MI" proposal you are addressing today does NOT support what the people of Michigan said loud and proud with their votes in 2018: we want all voices to be heard and all districts to represent people fairly. The proposed petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID - even if they are provided free of charge - serves to decrease participation. We want to INCREASE voter participation, not decrease!

This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots. Again, please do everything in your power to make access to voting in our democracy easier, not harder.

We want to hear from ALL voices. Please hear our voices asking you NOT to proceed with the proposed petition.

Thank you again for your service!
Carrie



Carrie Hatcher-Kay, Ph.D.

she/her/hers

Licensed Clinical Psychologist

(734) 730-3952

www.partnersinhealingpsychotherapy.com

www.votingaccessforall.org

Please note: Electronic Email is NOT secure, may not be read every day, and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues. The information included in this transmission may be confidential and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the designated addressee. If you are NOT the intended recipient or authorized to receive email for the addressee, you may not use, act upon, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in this message. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete/destroy message. Thank you!

From: [Toni Shaffer](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: No to Initiation of Legislation for Voter Photo ID
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:09:52 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Board of Canvassers:

The initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot is a legislation aimed at injustice. This legislation limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots.

The petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID, even if they are provided free of charge, serves to decrease participation. The petition also creates other barriers such as forbidding anyone to send out absentee ballot applications unless the voter requests it. Requests must include a state ID number.

It should not be legislated.

Thank you,

Toni Shaffer

From: [Marie Colombo](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Oppose the Secure MI Vote ballot initiative
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:34:13 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Board of Canvassers, I am writing to express my deep concern about the current attempt to circumvent the will of the majority of MI voters by creating this statutory ballot initiative. Michigan's 2020 election has been thoroughly and repeatedly examined and there was no evidence of widespread voter fraud—the voting process in Michigan is secure and to present restrictive measures as making it “secure” is a sham. Please decline to approve this measure.

Sincerely,

Marie Colombo

202 W. Sunnybrook

Royal Oak, MI. 48073

From: [irisg.rosen](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: petition summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:19:56 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

--

Iris Rosen

6586 E Knollwood Circle

W.Bloomfield, MI 48322

From: [Deborah Rosenman](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Proposed summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:48:17 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear BOC,

Your proposed summary is very misleading.

I would like to recommend this instead.

"An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots. "

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response,

Sincerely,

Debbie Rosenman

248-563-0433

From: [elizabeth.benyi](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Protect MI Vote Petition Summary
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 3:19:37 PM
Attachments: [Secure MI Vote Summary Petition](#)

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Please include the attached comments from me as part of the public record on the Protect MI Vote
Petition Summary
Elizabeth Benyi
Voter/Taxpayer
Calumet,MI
906-337-0368
erbhedgehog@yahoo.com

From: [Sean Mason](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Secure MI Vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 10:25:37 AM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Good morning,

The language of this initiative is flawed and needs revision. The language should begin with "3% OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT". Because to say that the people of the state of Michigan have any say in this ballot proposal is a blatant lie. To believe that this is not merely a ploy to ostracize the voice of Michiganders from the political process is to cling tightly to a version of reality that is plainly false.

I want you to think closely about what you're doing right now. You are deciding whether 3% of Michiganders can bypass a veto and approve whatever language that you agree to, without any say from the remaining 97% of voters in this state. Does that sound like a democratic process to you? No that sounds very much like the kind of society that those presenting this ballot so desperately wish to portray they are trying to fight against!

Simply put, If you agree to this language then you are agreeing that 3% of voters can dictate law to the remaining 97%, all without any say from our Representatives, our Governor, and us. For some reason our very democracy is in your hands yet again, make the right choice and reject this ballot, which is rotten to its very core.

Sincerely,

Sean Mason

From: [Denise Hartsough](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Public Comment on "Secure MI Vote" Petition Summary Language
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:40:14 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I find the proposed summary highly misleading.

Instead, I suggest that the following wording be used:

An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots.

Sincerely,
Denise Hartsough
2690 Timberleaf Lane
Kalamazoo MI 49006
269.599.1801 (cell)
denise.hartsough@gmail.com

From: [Nick](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: "Secure MI" Proposed Ballot Language
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:55:25 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing a public comment on the proposed ballot language from the "Secure MI".
The current proposed ballot language, for reference:

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections by amending Michigan Election code...(code section numbers listed)"

This proposed ballot language is riddled with opinion and editorializing. "Protect the right to vote", "increase confidence", "increase participation", and "protect election integrity" may be the stated goals of the petitioners, but they are merely their subjective interpretation of the proposed legislative changes. Proper ballot language would objectively describe the changes proposed by the initiative, to avoid unduly influencing or confusing ballot signers and general voters as to what will change if the legislation passes.

To that point, a proposal for revised ballot language:

"An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots"

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Spagnuolo

Nicholas Spagnuolo
3066 Bennington Drive
Wixom, MI 48393
(309) 229-7689
klungo@gmail.com

From: [Scott Urbanowski](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Public comment regarding petition summary - Secure MI Vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:48:19 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To whom it may concern:

I strongly object to the Petition Summary submitted by the "Secure MI Vote" ballot question committee regarding its initiative petition. The summary proposed by this committee repeatedly misrepresents what the proposal would do. It also fails to meet the legal requirement of Michigan Compiled Laws Section 168.482b(1)(b) that the summary be impartial.

Instead, I propose the following alternative petition summary

An initiation of legislation to amend the Michigan Election Law to: (i) limit which forms of photo identification a voter may use if they bring identification to a polling place; (ii) require voters without photo identification to vote provisional ballots not counted on Election Day; (iii) prohibit such voters' votes from being counted unless acceptable identification is brought to the clerk's office within six days; (iv) require personally identifiable information on absentee ballot and registration applications; (v) prohibit voters from applying for an absentee ballot online; (vi) provide voters' Social Security and driver's license information to all local clerks without safeguards; and (vii) prohibit election officials from using non-taxpayer funding sources for elections.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott Urbanowski
Kentwood

From: [Nomi Joyrich](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: public comment regarding summary of proposed "Secure MI" petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:26:49 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

The proposed summary of the "Secure MI" petition is very misleading and inaccurate. I propose using the following summary instead:

"An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots. "

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response,

sincerely,

Nancy Joyrich

248-497-1226

From: [Ashleigh Jennings](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Secure MI Vote Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:28:08 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I am writing in opposition to the proposed ballot summary from Secure MI Vote. The language is highly misleading and will not accurately inform voters about the intent of the petition. In fact, the language is not only inaccurate, but describes goals in direct opposition to the impact of the desired policy changes.

The impact of this petition, if adopted, would restrict participation in elections, provide additional, unnecessary limits on municipal clerks' ability to assist voters, and would require voters to risk identity theft in order to exercise their right to vote by absentee ballot.

A much more appropriate summary would include information to the effect of : "An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots."

Thank you,

--

Ashleigh Jennings
Troy, MI
517-420-4226

From: [Mark Brewer](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Public Comments & Suggested Summary Language of Promote the Vote re Secure MI Vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:20:14 PM
Attachments: [Public Comments & Suggested Smy Language of Promote the Vote re Secure MI Vote-PDF-MB.PDF](#)

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Attached for filing on behalf of Promote the Vote please find the above. Please confirm timely filing.

Mark Brewer

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
BOARD OF STATE CANVASSERS**

In re Petition Filed
By Secure MI Vote,

_____ /

GOODMAN ACKER, P.C.
MARK BREWER (P35661)
Attorneys for Promote the Vote
17000 West 10 Mile Rd.
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 483-5000
mbrewer@goodmanacker.com

_____ /

**PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED SUMMARY LANGUAGE
OF PROMOTE THE VOTE REGARDING SECURE MI VOTE PETITION**

By any measure the 2020 Michigan elections were an unprecedented success--record voter turnout, record absentee voting, and smooth administration despite the COVID pandemic--all done with integrity, accuracy, and without legal problems.

This petition is the latest effort to rewrite the history of the 2020 elections by perpetuating the Big Lie about them—that the presidential election results were wrong and that there was “fraud” which needs a “remedy.” Having failed in every lawsuit—and the lawyers who brought them sanctioned¹--and despite 250 legitimate post-election audits demonstrating the integrity of the elections,² Big Lie proponents now seek to foist on Michigan voters a rollback of

Michigan's Trusted Law Firm
GOODMAN ACKER P.C.

¹ See *King v Whitmer*, ED Mich No 20-13134 (Opinion and Order of August 25, 2021).

² See Department of State, “Post-election audit report confirms accuracy and integrity of Michigan’s election” (April 22, 2021).

Michiganders' voting rights at a level never seen before under the false pretense of "increasing confidence" and "protecting election integrity."

All that the sponsor has offered as a proposed "summary" of this voter suppression proposal is the formal title of the legislation. Treating that title as a "summary," it is neither true nor impartial, is written in legislative jargon instead of common everyday words, and fails to disclose the proposal's harmful effects on Michigan voters.

As detailed below, the proposed "summary" should be rejected in favor of the true and impartial alternative summary written in everyday language which discloses the major effects of the proposal if enacted.

I. PROMOTE THE VOTE

Promote The Vote ("PTV") is the statewide coalition of nonpartisan groups which successfully sponsored 2018 Proposal 3, the largest expansion of voting rights in Michigan history. Its members include the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS), ACLU of Michigan, America Votes, AFT Michigan, Asian & Pacific Islander American (APIA) Vote Michigan, Detroit Action, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation, League of Women Voters of Michigan, Michigan League for Public Policy, NAACP, and the NAACP Detroit Branch.

II. THE LEGAL STANDARDS GOVERNING PETITION SUMMARIES

Michigan law sets forth the standards a petition summary must meet:

(b) The summary is limited to not more than 100 words and must consist of a true and impartial statement of the purpose of the proposed amendment or question proposed in language that does not create prejudice for or against the proposed amendment or question proposed.

(c) The summary must be worded as to apprise the petition signers of the subject matter of the proposed amendment or question proposed, but does not need to be legally precise.

(d) The summary must be clearly written using words that have a common everyday meaning to the general public.

MCL 168.482b(2)(b)-(d).³ The standards used in MCL 168.482b are taken from several other statutes that have long governed the preparation of ballot summaries for proposals in Michigan. *Compare* MCL 168.482b *with* MCL 168.32(2), 168.85, and 168.643a. The contents of those ballot summaries provide guidance for what constitutes a compliant petition summary under MCL 168.482b.

For example, the Director and Board in their previous ballot summaries have repeatedly disclosed the *effect* of a proposal if adopted. For example, the summary for 2018 Proposal 1 stated that the proposal would:

- *Change several current violations from crimes to civil infractions.*

Similarly, the ballot summary for 2012 Proposal 4 was clear on the proposal's impact:

This proposal would:

- *Allow in-home care workers to bargain collectively with the Michigan Quality Home Care Council (MQHCC). Continue the*

³ Similar standards exist in other states. *See, e.g., Fairness and Accountability in Ins Reform v Greene*, 886 P2d 1338, 1346; 180 Ariz 582 (1994) (“[T]he purpose of the required analysis is to assist voters in rationally assessing an initiative proposal by providing a fair, neutral explanation of the proposal’s contents and the changes it would make if adopted The analysis and description must eschew advocacy—argument—for or against the proposal’s adoption.”); *Gaines v McCuen*, 758 SW2d 403, 406; 296 Ark 513 (Ark 1988) (“The ballot [summary] must accurately reflect the general purposes and fundamental provisions of the proposed initiative, so that an elector does not vote for a proposal based on its description in the ballot [summary], when, in fact, the vote is for a position he might oppose.”); *Advisory Opinion to Attorney Gen re Term Limits Pledge*, 718 So2d 798, 803 (Fla 1998) (holding that the purpose of requiring the explanatory statement “is to provide fair notice of the content of the proposed amendment so that the voter will not be misled as to its purpose, and can cast an intelligent and informed ballot”) (internal quotation omitted; citation omitted).

current exclusive representative of in-home care workers until modified in accordance with labor laws.

(emphasis added). Again and again, for decades ballot summaries prepared by the Director and approved by the Board under the same standards as MCL §168.482b have described the *effect* of the proposal. There are many more examples. See, e g, 2012 Proposal 2 (repeatedly stating effect on current and future laws); 1998 Proposal B (disclosing exemptions from transparency laws and creation of legal rights); 1996 Proposal D (creating a cause of action); 1994 Proposal B (disclosing loss of right to a criminal appeal if adopted); 1994 Proposal D (disclosing a limit on legal right to sue if adopted).

It is well-established that the effects of a proposal must be disclosed in a summary.⁴

III. THE PROPOSED SUMMARY DOESN'T MEET THE STANDARDS OF MCL 168.482B

A proposed summary from Secure MI Vote has not been publicly disclosed. There is only the title of the proposed legislation:

An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote, and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections, by amending Michigan Election Code sections 495, 523, 759, 759a, 759b, 761, 761b, 764b, and 813 (MCL 168.495, MCL 168.523, MCL 168.759, MCL 168.759a, MCL 169.759b, MCL 168.761, MCL 168.761b, MCL 168.764b, and MCL 168.813),

⁴ This is the law in other states as well. See, e g, *Advisory Op to Attorney Gen re Right to Competitive Energy Mkt for Customers of Investor-Owned Utils*, 287 So3d 1256, 1260 (Fla 2020) (ballot language “may be clearly and conclusively defective in violation of statutory requirements either in an affirmative sense, because it misleads the voters as to the *material effects* of the proposed amendment, or in a negative sense by failing to inform the voters of those *material effects*”) (emphasis added); *Sedey v Ashcroft*, 594 SW3d 256, 263 (Mo Ct App 2020) (when drafting summary statements under statute governing petitions for ballot initiatives for constitutional amendments, the Secretary of State “should accurately reflect the *legal and probable effects* of the proposed amendment”) (emphasis added).

and adding sections 523b (MCL 168.523b) 766a (MCL 168.760a) and 946 (MCL 168.946).

This isn't even an adequate bill title⁵ let alone a sufficient summary because it fails to meet the requirements of MCL 168.482b.

First, it asserts conclusions, not facts, in language which creates prejudice for the proposal—"protect the right to vote," "increase confidence in the conduct of elections." "increase participation," "protect election integrity," and "prohibiting special interest funding." All of those phrases are advocacy; they are value-laden, speculative opinions and conclusions which create prejudice for the proposal. They are not germane to a statement of purpose. No summary of a proposal affecting voting has ever contained such prejudicial language. See, e g, Ballot Summaries for 2018 Proposal 3 and Proposal 02-1.

Second, instead of factually describing the proposal in "clearly written" words with a "common everyday meaning to the general public," the summary spends 47 words, about half the summary, in legal jargon citing the election code. While this is required in the title of a legislative bill⁶, references to the election code in a petition summary are completely meaningless if not confusing to signers and tell them nothing about the purpose of the proposal. These statutory cites only use up valuable space which could be filled with information that informs signers what the proposal will do in plain English and serve no useful purpose. Moreover, if a signer wants to read them they can be found in the title and text of the legislation on the back of the petition.

⁵ See Legislative Service Bureau, "Legislative Drafting Manual" §101.

⁶ See *id.*

Next, the summary inaccurately describes the proposal in several ways. The first error is that the summary focuses on only 2 aspects of the proposal (and even those are inaccurately described), a claimed photo identification requirement to cast a ballot and the funding of elections. The summary fails to indicate that the proposal also affects voter registration, access to absentee applications, clerk and dropbox availability prior to elections, spending taxpayer money on free photo ID's, and an appropriation blocking a voter referendum. The summary fails to also disclose that the Legislature can adopt the proposal without a vote of the people at all, the stated goal of the sponsor. See Oosting, "Republicans launch 'secure MI vote' drive to reform Michigan election laws," Bridge Magazine, August 30, 2021.

An underinclusive summary such as this is inaccurate. See, e.g., *Burgess v Alaska Lieutenant Governor*, 654 P2d 273, 275 (Alaska 1982) (a summary must be "complete enough to convey an intelligible idea of the scope and import of the proposed law, and it ought to be free from any misleading tendency, whether of amplification, *of omission*, or of fallacy, and that it must contain no partisan coloring") (emphasis added); *Conway v Martin*, 499 SW3d 209, 212; 2016 Ark 322 (Ark 2016) (a summary of an initiated act must be "free from any misleading tendency, whether of amplification, *of omission*, or of fallacy, and it must not be tinged with partisan coloring") (emphasis added); *State ex rel Schuck v City of Columbus*, 152 Ohio St 3d 590, 594-95; 99 NE3d 383 (Ohio 2018) (summary of a ballot initiative must inform and protect the voter and presupposes a condensed text which is fair, honest, clear and *complete, and from which no essential part of the proposed amendment is omitted*) (emphasis

added); *Hopkins v. Rosenblum*, 460 P3d 503, 506; 366 Or 239 (Or 2020) (a ballot summary may be inaccurate because it is “*underinclusive* [by] identify[ing] the subject matter of a measure *by mentioning only some of its aspects, while leaving other, major aspects of the measure unmentioned*”) (emphasis added).

The second error as to accuracy lies in the woefully incorrect description of the photo ID and funding provisions. The summary states that the proposal “require[s] photo identification before casting a vote.” Plainly put, that’s wrong because the proposal significantly changes current law by limiting how voters verify their identity. In addition, a voter can still “cast” a vote without photo ID by absentee ballot or on election day—the proposal prevents that vote from *counting*.

The funding provision is incorrectly summarized as “prohibiting special interest funding of elections.” But the proposal is far broader than that, whatever the pejorative “special interest” may mean. Section 946(1) prohibits “in-kind contributions, or other consideration, from any individual or entity . . . to conduct or administer elections.” This would ban everything from federal government election funding to cities and townships loaning personnel and equipment to each other to churches and schools donating polling places to citizens volunteering their time to work on elections, and much more. Indeed, phone calls and emails between clerks or between clerks and the Bureau of Elections would be illegal under §946(1) as an “in-kind contribution” from “an individual or entity.” None of that is “special interest funding” of elections.

The biased, misleading, incomplete, inaccurate, and jargon-laden title of the legislation fails the standards of MCR 168.482b.

IV. THE ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY CURES THE DEFECTS OF THE PROPOSED SUMMARY AND MEETS THE STATUTORY STANDARDS

This alternative summary corrects the defects of the proposed summary by providing far more accurate information in plain English about the major aspects of the proposal. The summary makes much better use of the 100 words in simpler language:

Initiation of legislation to mandate that people disclose partial Social Security numbers when registering to vote; restrict options for registered voters to verify their identity; discard votes of registered voters who cannot meet the restricted options; prohibit election officials from providing absentee applications unless asked; spend millions of dollars providing free photo identification; require clerks' offices to open or provide ballot dropboxes for a week before an election; ban charitable contributions, including volunteer time, to help administer elections; and allow the Legislature to adopt the legislation without a vote of the people and block a peoples' referendum vote after adoption.

Unlike the proposed summary, this alternative describes the major aspects of the proposal succinctly and accurately in 100 words in the order in which they appear. It is not fatally underinclusive. *See, e g, Burgess, supra, Conway, supra; Schuck, supra; and Hopkins, supra.*

The alternative also eschews legal jargon and citations because it doesn't have to be "legally precise," instead employing words which "have a common everyday meaning to the public." MCL 168.482(2)(c), (d).

The alternative accurately describes the *effects* of the proposal—votes will be discarded, millions of dollars will be spent, dropboxes will be provided, a people's referendum will be blocked, etc.

Finally, each phrase is "true and impartial," creating no "prejudice for or against" the proposal. *Id.*

CLAUSE 1: “Mandate that people disclose partial Social Security numbers when registered to vote”

Section 495(f) mandates the disclosure of the last 4 digits of the Social Security number by people registering to vote as truthfully and impartially described in clause 1 of the alternative summary.

CLAUSE 2: “Restrict options for registered voters to verify their identity”

Clause 2 truthfully and impartially describes the proposal as restricting options for voters to verify their identity, principally by deleting the current, longstanding affidavit option in §523(2) and replacing it with the limited list of identification documents or means in §§523(3), (6), (7); 759; 759a; 759b, and 761. Unlike the proposed summary, this clause does not use the inaccurate phrase “photo ID,” as an omnibus, but incorrect description of the new identity verification requirements. As set forth in the proposal, photo ID is *not* the only identification option and it is completely misleading to mention it only.

CLAUSE 3: “Discard votes of registered voters who cannot meet the restricted options”

This clause truthfully and impartially describes the effect of a voter failing to comply with the restricted options of §§552(3), (6) and (7): the vote she or he has already cast is discarded under *id* (6) and (7).

CLAUSE 4: “Prohibit election officials from providing absentee applications when asked”

Clause 4 truthfully and impartially describes the prohibitions in §759(1) on absentee application distribution.

CLAUSE 5: “Spend millions of dollars to provide free photo identification”

This clause truthfully and impartially lays out the purpose of the fund created by §523b.

CLAUSE 6: “Require Clerk’s offices to open or provide ballot dropboxes for a week before an election”

This clause truthfully and impartially describes the requirements of §761b(5).

CLAUSE 7: “Ban charitable contributions, including volunteer time, to help administer elections”

This clause truthfully and impartially describes the broad effect of §946(1).

CLAUSE 8: “Allow the legislature to adopt the legislation without a vote of the people and block a peoples’ referendum after adoption”

This clause truthfully and impartially informs signers that the Legislature can adopt the proposed legislation under Art 2, §9 of the Michigan Constitution. Sponsors of the proposal have stated that that is their intent. See Mauger, “Michigan Republicans launching petition drive to require ID’s for voting,” Detroit News, August 30, 2021; Bridge Michigan, *supra*. Under current law, Clause 8 also accurately informs signers of the effect of the appropriation in §523b(5) barring a referendum on the proposal if adopted. See *MUCC v Secretary of State*, 464 Mich 359; 630 NW2d 297 (2001) (appropriation bars referendum). Signers are entitled to know these 2 important pieces of information.

CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons stated the proposed summary should be rejected and the alternative summary adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark Brewer
MARK BREWER (P35661)
GOODMAN ACKER, PC
Attorneys for Promote the Vote
17000 West 10 Mile Road
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 483-5000
mbrewer@goodmanacker.com

Dated: September 9, 2021

From: [Nomi Joyrich](#)
To: [Carrie Hatcher-Kay](#)
Cc: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Re: NO on Secure MI Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:13:26 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I want to clarify what the NOV is meeting on and what power they have. The “Secure MI Vote” has the constitutional right to gather petition signatures. The BOC does not have the authority to stop this. However they do have the authority to accept or reject the brief summary that appears at the top of every petition.

The current proposed summary is misleading and the BOC can require that they change it. Public comments to the BOC about this are due today at 5pm.

I sent them a comment and suggested the following petition summary be used instead . (Feel free to copy or write your own.”

I sent an email to all of you earlier today with more details and a link to the current proposed petition.

Here’s my suggested text:

An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots.

Thanks,
Nomi

On Thu, Sep 9, 2021 at 3:59 PM Carrie Hatcher-Kay <chatcherkay@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Canvassers, Thank you for your hard work and service to our state.

The people of Michigan voted overwhelmingly in favor of Prop 3 for MORE access to voting in 2018. And in favor of Prop 2 which established your commission.

The "Secure MI" proposal you are addressing today does NOT support what the people of Michigan said loud and proud with their votes in 2018: we want all voices to be heard and all districts to represent people fairly. The proposed petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID - even if they are provided free of charge - serves to decrease participation. We want to INCREASE voter participation, not decrease!

This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots. Again, please do everything in your power to make access to voting in our democracy easier, not harder.

We want to hear from ALL voices. Please hear our voices asking you NOT to proceed with the proposed petition.

Thank you again for your service!
Carrie



Carrie Hatcher-Kay, Ph.D.

she/her/hers

Licensed Clinical Psychologist

(734) 730-3952

www.partnersinhealingpsychotherapy.com

www.votingaccessforall.org

Please note: Electronic Email is NOT secure, may not be read every day, and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues. The information included in this transmission may be confidential and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the designated addressee. If you are NOT the intended recipient or authorized to receive email for the addressee, you may not use, act upon, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in this message. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete/destroy message. Thank you!

From: [Nomi Joyrich](#)
To: [Carrie Hatcher-Kay](#)
Cc: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Re: NO on Secure MI Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:13:26 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I want to clarify what the NOV is meeting on and what power they have. The “Secure MI Vote” has the constitutional right to gather petition signatures. The BOC does not have the authority to stop this. However they do have the authority to accept or reject the brief summary that appears at the top of every petition.

The current proposed summary is misleading and the BOC can require that they change it. Public comments to the BOC about this are due today at 5pm.

I sent them a comment and suggested the following petition summary be used instead . (Feel free to copy or write your own.”

I sent an email to all of you earlier today with more details and a link to the current proposed petition.

Here’s my suggested text:

An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before casting a ballot or requesting an absentee ballot. This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots.

Thanks,
Nomi

On Thu, Sep 9, 2021 at 3:59 PM Carrie Hatcher-Kay <chatcherkay@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Canvassers, Thank you for your hard work and service to our state.

The people of Michigan voted overwhelmingly in favor of Prop 3 for MORE access to voting in 2018. And in favor of Prop 2 which established your commission.

The "Secure MI" proposal you are addressing today does NOT support what the people of Michigan said loud and proud with their votes in 2018: we want all voices to be heard and all districts to represent people fairly. The proposed petition is NOT about protecting the vote or increasing participation. Requiring photo ID - even if they are provided free of charge - serves to decrease participation. We want to INCREASE voter participation, not decrease!

This legislation also limits the ability of city clerks and other government employees and officials from sending applications for absentee ballots. Again, please do everything in your power to make access to voting in our democracy easier, not harder.

We want to hear from ALL voices. Please hear our voices asking you NOT to proceed with the proposed petition.

Thank you again for your service!
Carrie



Carrie Hatcher-Kay, Ph.D.

she/her/hers

Licensed Clinical Psychologist

(734) 730-3952

www.partnersinhealingpsychotherapy.com

www.votingaccessforall.org

Please note: Electronic Email is NOT secure, may not be read every day, and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues. The information included in this transmission may be confidential and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the designated addressee. If you are NOT the intended recipient or authorized to receive email for the addressee, you may not use, act upon, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in this message. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete/destroy message. Thank you!

From: [Roberta Kennedy](#)
To: [Vicki Benson](#)
Cc: [Kathy Curell](#); [Susan Weitz](#); [ptr.kayvala.com](#); [MDOS-Canvassers](#); [Paula Jonas](#); [Allison Wilcox](#); [Eileen Grew](#); [cathy.anders.kayvala.com](#); [Katherine Veese](#); [Claudia Warren](#); [Jan Baumgras](#); [Grace Hagerty](#); [Jim Johnson](#); [Hugh Gershon](#); [Jill Haver-Crissman](#); [Kathleen List](#); [Katrina Bucknell](#); [Kim Murphy-Kovalick](#); [Kathy Dolan](#); [Les Lesiewicz](#); [Marsha Gottesman](#); [Rachel Diehl](#)
Subject: Re: Secure MI Vote petition
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 8:15:34 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I have to “echo” what Susan, Kathy, and Vicki wrote. Great letter! Now how do we get more people to read it?

Bobbi

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 8, 2021, at 1:54 PM, Vicki Benson <vbenso2870@gmail.com> wrote:

Peter, This is excellent. I agree with Susan, this should be published in the paper or multiple papers. Perhaps this could be an opinion article since it may be too long for a letter to the editor. Great job. Vicki

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021, 1:38 PM Kathy Curell <kcurell@gmail.com> wrote:

Great work Peter! Thank you. I will be doing this too.

Kathleen

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 8, 2021, at 1:06 PM, Susan Weitz <sifw1967@gmail.com> wrote:

Peter,

This piece is so good, and so accurate!

Could it also be used as an LTE?

--Susan

On Wed, 8 Sept 2021 at 12:00, ptr [kayvala.com](mailto:ptr@kayvala.com)

<ptr@kayvala.com> wrote:

Dear Secretary of State and Board of State

Canvassers -

I am writing to protest the Secure MI Vote petition under your consideration.

The petition assumes that Michigan's access to voting should be amended to protect against voter fraud. This not true: Michigan's last election had a record turn out and the polling was nearly error-free – an independent, bipartisan audit committee found no evidence of misconduct of election officials.

The petition is a bi-product of the (Big) lie that Donald Trump lost the 2020 election because of voter fraud. It is an attempt to reach around our governor's likely veto of several copy-cat laws proposed by Michigan's Republican legislature – a culmination of the Heritage Foundation's effort to pass anti-voter legislation in Michigan, Iowa, Texas and other states.

The petition summary is misleading:

The petition does not 'protect the right to vote', nor 'increase confidence in the conduct of elections,' and - **especially** - nor 'protect election integrity.' Petition signers won't know Secure MI Vote would prohibit election officials to send unsolicited absentee ballot applications. Nor would they be aware that this initiative would never go to a ballot, that it is intended to be directly adopted with signatures of merely 3.4% of Michigan's population. It would undermine the results of Prop 3, a voter-access bill passed by 66.8% of Michigan voters in 2018.

Our state deserves better than this. Please reject those of bad faith. Turn down the cynical Secure MI Vote petition.

Sincerely,

Ptr

Peter Anders PhD

4416 Andre St Midland, MI 48642

From: ptr.kayvala.com
To: MDOS-Canvassers
Cc: [Paula Jonas](#); [Allison Wilcox](#); [Eileen Grew](#); cathy.anders.kayvala.com; [Katherine Veese](#); [Claudia Warren](#); [Jan Baumgras](#); [Grace Hagerty](#); [Jim Johnson](#); [Hugh Gershon](#); [Jill Haver-Crissman](#); [Kathleen List](#); [Katrina Bucknell](#); [Kathy Currell](#); [Kim Murphy-Kovalick](#); [Kathy Dolan](#); [Les Lesiewicz](#); [Marsha Gottesman](#); ptr.kayvala.com; [Roberta Kennedy](#); [Susan Weitz](#); [Vicki Benson](#); [Rachel Diehl](#)
Subject: Re: Secure MI Vote petition
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 12:00:04 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Secretary of State and Board of State Canvassers -

I am writing to protest the Secure MI Vote petition under your consideration.

The petition assumes that Michigan's access to voting should be amended to protect against voter fraud. This not true: Michigan's last election had a record turn out and the polling was nearly error-free – an independent, bipartisan audit committee found no evidence of misconduct of election officials.

The petition is a bi-product of the (Big) lie that Donald Trump lost the 2020 election because of voter fraud. It is an attempt to reach around our governor's likely veto of several copy-cat laws proposed by Michigan's Republican legislature – a culmination of the Heritage Foundation's effort to pass anti-voter legislation in Michigan, Iowa, Texas and other states.

The petition summary is misleading:

The petition does not 'protect the right to vote', nor 'increase confidence in the conduct of elections,' and - **especially** - nor 'protect election integrity.' Petition signers won't know Secure MI Vote would prohibit election officials to send unsolicited absentee ballot applications. Nor would they be aware that this initiative would never go to a ballot, that it is intended to be directly adopted with signatures of merely 3.4% of Michigan's population. It would undermine the results of Prop 3, a voter-access bill passed by 66.8% of Michigan voters in 2018.

Our state deserves better than this. Please reject those of bad faith. Turn down the cynical Secure MI Vote petition.

Sincerely,

Pttr

Peter Anders PhD

4416 Andre St Midland, MI 48642

From: [Jill Haver-Crissman](#)
To: [Roberta Kennedy](#)
Cc: [Allison Wilcox](#); [Claudia Warren](#); [Eileen Grew](#); [Grace Hagerty](#); [Hugh Gershon](#); [Jan Baumgras](#); [Jim Johnson](#); [Katherine Veaser](#); [Kathleen List](#); [Kathy Curell](#); [Kathy Dolan](#); [Katrina Bucknell](#); [Kim Murphy-Kovalick](#); [Les Lesiewicz](#); [MDOS-Canvassers](#); [Marsha Gottesman](#); [Paula Jonas](#); [Rachel Diehl](#); [Susan Weitz](#); [Vicki Benson](#); [cathy.anders.kayvala.com](#); [ptr.kayvala.com](#)
Subject: Re: Secure MI Vote petition
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 9:07:37 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Beautiful!!!

Thank you!

Jill

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 8:15 PM Roberta Kennedy <rhkennedy6@yahoo.com> wrote:
I have to “echo” what Susan, Kathy, and Vicki wrote. Great letter! Now how do we get more people to read it?

Bobbi

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 8, 2021, at 1:54 PM, Vicki Benson <vbenso2870@gmail.com> wrote:

Peter, This is excellent. I agree with Susan, this should be published in the paper or multiple papers. Perhaps this could be an opinion article since it may be too long for a letter to the editor. Great job. Vicki

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021, 1:38 PM Kathy Curell <kcurell@gmail.com> wrote:
Great work Peter! Thank you. I will be doing this too.
Kathleen

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 8, 2021, at 1:06 PM, Susan Weitz
<sifw1967@gmail.com> wrote:

Peter,

This piece is so good, and so accurate!

Could it also be used as an LTE?

--Susan

On Wed, 8 Sept 2021 at 12:00, ptr [kayvala.com](mailto:ptr@kayvala.com)

<ptr@kayvala.com> wrote:

Dear Secretary of State and Board of State
Canvassers -

I am writing to protest the Secure MI Vote petition under
your consideration.

The petition assumes that Michigan's access to voting
should be amended to protect against voter fraud. This
not true: Michigan's last election had a record turn out
and the polling was nearly error-free – an independent,
bipartisan audit committee found no evidence of
misconduct of election officials.

The petition is a bi-product of the (Big) lie that
Donald Trump lost the 2020 election because of voter
fraud. It is an attempt to reach around our governor's
likely veto of several copy-cat laws proposed by
Michigan's Republican legislature – a culmination of the
Heritage Foundation's effort to pass anti-voter legislation
in Michigan, Iowa, Texas and other states.

The petition summary is misleading:

The petition does not 'protect the right to vote', nor 'increase
confidence in the conduct of elections,' and - **especially** - nor
'protect election integrity.' Petition signers won't know Secure
MI Vote would prohibit election officials to send unsolicited
absentee ballot applications. Nor would they be aware that this
initiative would never go to a ballot, that it is intended to be
directly adopted with signatures of merely 3.4% of Michigan's
population. It would undermine the results of Prop 3, a voter-
access bill passed by 66.8% of Michigan voters in 2018.

Our state deserves better than this. Please reject those of bad
faith. Turn down the cynical Secure MI Vote petition.

Sincerely,

Ptr

Peter Anders PhD

[4416 Andre St. Midland, MI 48642](#)

From: [Lissa Oliver](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI petition language
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:01:52 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

To Whom it May Concern,

The short summary proposed for the Secure MI petitions is pretty misleading and should be amended to more accurately reflect the proposed changes to MI election law.

Even though a citizen provides proof of identity when registering to vote, this proposed legislation would require the same proof at two more points in the process—applying for an absent voter application and for casting a ballot. That should be made more clear:

"An initiation of legislation that would require photo identification before requesting an absentee ballot and casting a ballot. Provisional ballots would no longer be accepted with a signed affidavit. City clerks and other election officials would be prohibited from sending applications for absentee ballots without specific request from the voter."

Overall this is a waste of time and effort—what is the problem this petition is trying to solve? "Security"? Give me a break.

Thank you,
Lissa

From: [Melissa Zinn](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Secure Mi Vote 100-Word Summary is Misleading
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:38:09 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote" - It does not protect the right to vote, it infringes upon the right to vote.

"and increase confidence in the conduct of elections" - *Its* very existence is intended to undermine confidence in the conduct of elections and stoke the flames of The Big Lie.

"by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot" - This is doubly misleading. First, Michigan already requires photo ID to vote, and second, this summary does not tell potential signers that the option to sign a legally binding affidavit in order to vote if one forgets to bring ID to the polls will be taken away.

"to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote" - This is misleading in three ways. First, many people can already obtain free ID cards in Michigan. From the Secretary of State website: "Michigan law allows the Secretary of State's Office to waive state identification card fees for residents who are:

- Age 65 or older
- Legally blind
- Veterans
- Homeless
- Adding or removing the organ donor registry heart sticker
- Not allowed to drive because their license was suspended due to a physical or mental disability
- Receiving state aid"

Secondly, the petition does not address any of the myriad other reasons someone might have trouble obtaining an ID, such as lack of transportation, lack of child care, inflexible work schedule, lack of necessary supporting documents. Third, the reason for the appropriation is to make the petition referendum-proof if it is passed into law.

and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections - The term "special interest" is intentionally misleading. This bill would prohibit any group, be it a non-profit, non-partisan organization interested in good government, a charity, or a local citizens group that wishes to bring refreshments to poll workers, from giving much-needed funds to local clerks offices, and the petition, thought it does have an appropriation, does not appropriate funds for clerks offices.

This summary also leaves out the provision requiring absentee voters to include their drivers license or state id number and the last four digits of their social security number, which would make them very vulnerable to identity theft. In fact, the summary does not mention absentee voting, which is enormously popular in Michigan. Any measures to make absentee voting more difficult will be unpopular

with voters, and Secure Mi Vote knows that. They are not operating in good faith, and the least the citizens of Michigan deserve is an accurate summary of a petition that would negatively impact the ability of many Michiganders to vote.

Thank you,
Melissa Zinn
928 Parker Ave
Kalamazoo, Mi
49008

From: [Mary Brown](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Announcement and upcoming petition
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 8:30:12 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Hello,

I have read the proposed language for the Secure MI Vote petition and find it a significant misrepresentation of the intent of proposed changes in Michigan election laws.

The title of the petition is the first misrepresentation. Securethis last election was evaluated through some 250 audits and judged by a bipartisan committee to be secure. This after more than 3 million voted absentee in the middle of a pandemic. This title suggests to the citizens of Michigan that previous elections were NOT secure. Yet we know that is not true.

Within the petition summary is the wording that suggests that a signature on this petition will help to protect the right to vote. In fact, the result would be just the opposite. It would limit the right to vote for many Michiganders. Especially as one provision limits funding. Since elections are currently underfunded by the state, we know that nonpartisan organizations often help states fund their elections. There are substantial reasons why clerks within Michigan have been opposed to the discussions taking place with the Senate Elections Committee.

One phrase in the summary is a falsehood. It implies that identification is not currently required. It is. We also know that no excuse absentee ballot increased voter participation. It was not the lack of identification.

The listing of MCL numbers and especially the additions would make this petition extremely long for the typical citizen to read. This suggests that the summary does not really list all the ramifications of voting rights.

I strongly urge you to deny approval of this petition. It's not an attempt to "secure" the vote; nor an attempt to "protect voting rights" instead it is just the opposite. Voting has already been evaluated to be secure, and this petition casts doubts in the minds of Michigan citizen's as to the integrity of elections. And it limits voting rights for select Michigan citizens but only upon a very thorough read. It's an attempt to fool the public.

Thank you,

Mary Brown

From: [Abby Rubley](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote ballot petition: Michigan Democratic Party's public comment submission
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:45:00 PM
Attachments: [Submission to Bureau of Elections re Secure MI Vote 100-word Proposal for Ballot Initiative 090921.pdf](#)

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Please see the Michigan Democratic Party's public comment submission regarding the Secure MI Vote ballot petition.

All the best,
Abby

--

Abby Rubley
Director of Communications
Michigan Democratic Party
517.420.6777
arubley@michigandems.com

September 9, 2021

Jonathan Brater
Director of Elections
Bureau of Elections
Richard H. Austin Building, 1st Floor
430 W. Allegan
Lansing, MI 48918
MDOS-Canvassers@Michigan.gov

Chair
Lavera Barnes

Executive Director
Christine Jensen

1st Vice Chair
Mark LaChey

2nd Vice Chair
Fay Beydoun

Governor
Gretchen Whitmer

**Re: The Michigan Democratic Party's Comment on *Secure MI Vote's*
Proposed Petition Summary**

Dear Director Brater:

To be clear, the Michigan Democratic Party (“MDP”) finds the entirety of *Secure MI Vote's* proposed ballot petition, including its summary, repugnant to the fundamental right to vote and to both the Michigan and U.S. Constitutions. No 100-word summary – no matter how crafted – can cure the illegalities and backhanded attempts to discourage absentee voting throughout the body of the petition. By all accounts, the petition is an attempt to use the initiative process to thwart, rather than further, the will of the vast majority of Michigan voters.

Nevertheless, in response to your September 2, 2021 announcement inviting public comment on *Secure MI Vote's* proposed summary of its draft ballot initiative (“Proposed Summary”) for approval under Section 482b of the Michigan Election Law, MCL 168.482b, the MDP hereby requests that you reject the Proposed Summary in its entirety and replace it with the more transparent, accurate, and impartial alternative summary presented at the end of this submission.

Section 482b of the Election Law Requires Transparency, Truth, and Impartiality

A citizen-led legislative initiative is a powerful tool, particularly in Michigan where there is potential for a small fraction of the state's registered voters to drive veto-proof legislation with profound effects on citizens' most fundamental right to vote.¹ The Legislature recognized this power and the potential for its abuse. That is why Michigan Election Law now requires that any petition summary be truthful, impartial, and informative. See MCL 168.482b. *Secure MI Vote's* Proposed Summary lacks all these attributes. For the reasons stated in more detail below, we

¹ Article 2, § 9 of the Michigan Constitution permits the Legislature to consider an initiative petition that is certified by the Board of State Canvassers for 40 days and adopt it as is. If so, the petition becomes law, without the matter going on the ballot for the people to vote on it, thereby depriving Michigan's electors of an opportunity to decide.

encourage the Director of Elections and the Board of State Canvassers to reject the Proposed Summary because it does not satisfy the clear mandates in Section 482b and it is plainly deceitful.²

In 2018, Michigan’s Election Law was amended to permit sponsors of a ballot initiative to seek prior approval from the Board of State Canvassers of the 100-word summary of the proposed legislation that, if approved, would be affixed to the top of the petition sheet. MCL 168.482b(1) and (3). To be eligible for approval, therefore, the Proposed Summary:

- “must consist of a **true and impartial statement** of the purpose of the proposed amendment or question proposed in language that does **not create prejudice for or against** the proposed amendment or question proposed.” MCL 168.482b(2)(b) (emphasis added); and
- “must be worded so as to **apprise the petition signers of the subject matter** of the proposed amendment or question proposed but does not need to be legally precise.” MCL 168.482b(2)(c) (emphasis added).

The Proposed Summary Does Not Adequately Apprise the Public of the Subject Matter

Although Section 482b of the Election Law provides that the 100-word summary “does not need to be legally precise,” MCL 168.482b(2)(c), it must fairly “apprise” the public of the petition’s content and certainly cannot deceive the public. The Proposed Summary, however, does not “apprise” the public of important aspects of the petition, which are discovered only through a close read of the proposed amendment.

Noticeably absent from the Proposed Summary is any reference to the draft petition’s negative impact on access to absentee voter applications and ballots. Indeed, a significant portion of the Proposed Summary directly impacts absentee voting, including, most notably, by:

(a) prohibiting public officials, including local clerks, from providing AV ballot applications without first receiving an individual request, see Section 759(1) (an issue that was heavily litigated in 2020, see *Davis v Secretary of State*, 333 Mich App 588 (2020) *Davis v. Sec’y of State*, 333 Mich App 588, *appeal denied*, 506 Mich 1040, 951 NW 2d 911 (2020) (“We find that the Secretary of State’s action in sending an application which each registered voter was free to fill out and return, or not, fell within her authority as chief elections officer of the state, and comported with her constitutional obligation to liberally construe Const. 1963, art. 2, § 4(1) to effectuate its purposes.”));

(b) requiring absentee voters to confirm identification *in person* if they do not provide sensitive personal information by mail, significantly burdening voters and defeating the very premise of voting absentee, see Section 759(4); and

(c) providing for the first time ever a provisional AV ballot mechanism that is likely to confuse and, thus, deter absentee voters. See Section 759(4).

² This response does not, and is not intended to, address the myriad deficiencies and serious constitutional infirmities in the proposed initiative.

Michigan voters recently and resoundingly decided, by more than a 2-to-1 margin, to embed no-reason absentee voting into Article 2, Section 4(1)(g) of the Michigan Constitution with the hope that voting would be less time-consuming and more convenient for everyone in the state. As amended on November 6, 2018 by Proposal No. 18-3 (“Proposal 3”), Const. 1963, art 2, sec 4(1)(g) provides: “Every citizen of the United States who is an elector qualified to vote in Michigan shall have the following rights: * * * The right, once registered, to vote an absent voter ballot without giving a reason, during the forty (40) days before an election, and the right to choose whether the absent voter ballot is applied for, received and submitted in person or by mail...” The Constitution compels that this provision be “liberally construed in favor of voters’ rights in order to effectuate its purposes.”

Yet, the Proposed Summary is conspicuously devoid of any reference to absentee voting, let alone the significant restrictions on absentee voting and undermining of the Constitutional amendment that would result. See *Vernor v Secretary of State*, 179 Mich 157, 160; 146 NW 338, 339 (1914) (the title of an act must fairly indicate the purpose of the legislation, reflect a fair index of the act, and fairly inform the public of its purposes as a whole); Const. 1963, art 4, § 24 (“No law shall embrace more than one object, which shall be expressed in its title.”). *Secure MI Vote’s* silence on absentee voting in its Proposed Summary speaks volumes to its intent to deceive. Perhaps this deception is unsurprising given how popular absentee voting in Michigan is, with 60 percent of voters utilizing this option in the November 2020 election.

The Proposed Summary also hides from the public the new requirement in Section 495 that voters must provide the last four digits of their social security numbers as a precondition to register to vote, to which thousands of local clerks would have access without any meaningful security in place to protect private voter data from identity theft, see new Section 760a. This new social security number requirement is significant, but absent from the Proposed Summary.

And nowhere in the Proposed Summary is any reference to the elimination of the right of the people to vote without photo identification via affidavit. See MCL 168.523(2). In 2007, our Supreme Court highlighted the importance of the affidavit vote in the Michigan Election Law, noting that having the option to sign an affidavit in lieu of providing photo identification furthers “Michigan’s compelling regulatory interest in preventing voter fraud and enforcing art. 2, § 4 to ‘preserve the purity of elections’ and ‘to guard against abuses of the elective franchise’...”. *In re Request for Advisory Opinion Regarding Constitutionality of 2005 PA 71*, 479 Mich 1, 28 (2007) (“Here, even less of a burden is imposed on voters, since no voter need ever incur any secondary costs because of the affidavit alternative...”). Yet, the Proposed Summary remains silent about the repudiation of this important, existing right provided to Michigan voters who cannot present photo identification to vote – including for a variety of legitimate reasons. The people of the State of Michigan who are being asked to sign this petition should be apprised of the elimination of this significant voting right.

Moreover, many of the proposed changes conflict with current Election Law provisions but are not mentioned in the Proposed Summary. For example, the initiative would require in-person voters to sign the application for a ballot affirming that the voter resides at the address in the Qualified Voter File. Yet under Michigan Election Law, the voter does not have access to the Qualified Voter File and may not know what address is there. Furthermore, provisions in the

current Election Law allow a voter who has changed their address from the address that appears in the Qualified Voter File to vote one last time in their old precinct if they moved within the same city or township, or if they moved to a new city or township during the 60 days prior to an election. See MCL 168.507(1) and MCL 168.507a. *Secure MI Vote's* Proposed Summary excludes these obvious conflicts with the Election Law.

The Proposed Summary is Neither True Nor Impartial

In addition to hiding critical aspects of the proposed legislation that negatively impact the public's right to vote, the Proposed Summary is replete with deceptive and inaccurate editorialization not permitted by Section 482b.

According to *Secure MI Vote's* Proposed Summary, the initiative purports to “protect the right to vote” and “increase confidence” in the election process by requiring “photo identification” before voting. Requiring photo identification to cast a ballot is no doubt a contentious legal issue, often depriving eligible voters of meaningful access to the election process. There is no truth to the assertion that photo identification mandates “protect the right to vote” or “increase confidence” in the election process. To the contrary, photo identification requirements have historically created unfair barriers to the voting booth for certain underprivileged communities and have discouraged voting.

Further, the Proposed Summary says that the initiative will “increase participation” by providing “free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote.” Once again, this is false and deceptive. The only way that free photo identification would “increase participation” is if the current option to sign an affidavit in lieu of photo identification did not exist. But as *Secure MI Vote* is certainly aware, it does. As written, an unsuspecting elector would be signing a petition to make it markedly more difficult to vote by removing the affidavit option, with only a limited (and flawed) exception for “free” identification.

To be sure, “free photo identification” is not the pro-voter panacea the Proposed Summary claims, as the actual language in the new Section 523b of the petition conditions receipt of the so-called “free photo identification” on an annual “appropriation,” which is outside the control of eligible voters, and requires an individual to apply for a waiver of the state identification fee by identifying an undefined “hardship.” Moreover, the petition does nothing to accommodate or assist voters who are unable to acquire photo identification because they lack the required documents and are unable to obtain them. None of this will “increase participation” in the election process, rendering the Proposed Summary in that regard neither true nor impartial. Moreover, the waiver application is not guaranteed to be accepted. Consequently, it is patently untrue that free photo identification will go to “anyone needing it to vote.”

The Proposed Summary also fails to disclose that the petition includes a new “Voter Access Fund” by appropriating \$3 Million to cover increased election costs. See new Section 523b. Not only should the public be apprised of this hidden use of tax-payer dollars, but it should also know about the proponent's veiled *attempt* – even if legally illegitimate – to render its proposed legislation resistant to repeal by way of referendum. See Const. 1963, art 2, § 9. Setting aside the

legal impropriety of that maneuver, the *Secure MI Vote* summary hides its obvious intent to prevent the people from repealing the statute by referendum should they find it undesirable (which it is).

Finally, *Secure MI Vote*'s petition purports to "protect election integrity" by "prohibiting special interest funding of elections." The actual petition language, however, goes far beyond so-called special interest funding. In fact, the words "special interest funding" are nowhere in the actual petition language. Instead, the petition, which seeks to add an entirely new Section 946, contains an overly broad and vague prohibition on private entities or individuals making donations of any kind, including in-kind contributions, to assist in the administration of elections. Rather than "protect election integrity," the new Section 946 serves to limit free speech in elections and subjects individuals, churches, businesses, and other organizations to potential criminal penalties for unwittingly making a direct or indirect in-kind contribution, among other things.

Specifically, the new Section 946 says that any public official, including local officials "shall not accept or use any private funds, in-kind contributions, or other consideration, from any individual or entity, either directly or indirectly, to conduct or administer an election." And this prohibition "applies to any election related activities..., as well as election-related equipment, such as tabulators, communication devices, signs, tents, voting facilities or locations, or absent voter drop boxes." This overly broad prohibition, which is at a minimum constitutionally infirm under the First Amendment and Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution, appears to conflict with other portions of the current Election Law. For example, Section 673a permits the county chairs of major political parties to submit to local clerks lists of persons interested in serving as election inspectors. Far from viewing it as a threat to election integrity, the Michigan Senate Oversight Committee in its *Initial Report on The November 2020 Election In Michigan* of June 2021 encouraged the Wayne County Republican Party and officials in the county and city clerks' offices to work together to recruit election inspectors. *Secure MI Vote*'s petition, however, would likely make this a prohibited "in-kind contribution." Likewise, the new Section 946 would prohibit churches, nursing homes, and other nonprofit and private entities from donating their facilities for the conduct of an election on their premises, subjecting them to potential criminal punishment for doing so.

This prohibition of legitimate support and donation would mark a seismic shift in how elections are conducted in Michigan, yet the Proposed Summary misleads the public by labeling the appropriate exercise of political speech and support of voter access to the polls "special interest funding," which obviously has a negative connotation designed to "create prejudice for...the proposed amendment" in violation of Section 482b(2)(b).

Alternative 100-Word Summary

Based on the foregoing, the MDP asks the Director of Elections to reject the Proposed Summary and, instead, adopt the following alternative summary, which complies with MCL 168.482b and better reflects the content and true purpose of *Secure MI Vote*'s proposed – albeit flawed – initiative, which electors should reject if they were to read the actual petition language:

“An initiation of legislation restricting absentee voting and adding to the election law by: limiting election officials’ ability to make absentee ballot applications available to voters; requiring absentee voters to provide new identifying information on ballot applications; if they do not, requiring absentee voters to provide identification in-person before counting their vote; prohibiting private individuals and organizations from donating money, time, or resources to support elections; requiring social security numbers to register to vote; prohibiting counting ballots cast by registered voters without photo ID; and appropriating \$3,000,000 of tax dollars to cover additional election costs mandated by the legislation.”

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Lavora R. Barnes".

Lavora Barnes
Chair
Michigan Democratic Party

From: [Ursula Whitcher](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: secure MI vote ballot proposal summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 8:10:23 AM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Michigan Board of Canvassers,

I am writing to ask for revisions of the proposed summary of the Secure MI Vote proposed ballot initiative.

First, the statement that the legislation will "protect the right to vote and increase confidence in elections" is partisan and misleading. The summary should focus on what the initiative does, not on how its proponents want voters to feel about it.

Second, the initiative prohibits mailing of unrequested ballots to voters. I voted absentee in the 2020 election. As someone who has had COVID, I appreciated this increased safety and flexibility very much. Voters need to know about the impact of this initiative on possible absentee voting methods.

Third, the initiative prohibits all outside funding or in-kind donations for the conduct of voting, including "voting facilities or locations". Voters should know that this legislation may lead to changes in their usual polling place.

Sincerely,

Ursula Whitcher.

From: [Joan Firestone](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Ballot Summary Concerns
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:32:17 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers,

There are significant, serious issues with the SecureMiVote petition summary that need to be addressed before it is passed.

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

Joan Firestone

1285 Lake Crescent
Bloomfield, Michigan 48302
248-563-3319

From: [Joan Firestone](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Ballot Summary Concerns
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:32:17 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers,

There are significant, serious issues with the SecureMiVote petition summary that need to be addressed before it is passed.

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

Joan Firestone

1285 Lake Crescent
Bloomfield, Michigan 48302
248-563-3319

From: [rondi brower](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Ballot Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:22:03 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Michigan Board of Canvassers,

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading. Please do not allow it to be used in its current form. Signers should have clear, accurate information when they are being asked to sign something.

Sincerely,
Rondi E. Brower
1376 Leroy St.
Ferndale, MI 48220

From: [Rochelle Rubin](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Cc: [Rochelle Rubin](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Ballot Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:46:07 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

Rochelle Rubin

Rochelle Rubin
2602 Peterboro Court
West Bloomfield, Michigan 48323
248-737-0852 (home)
248-421-6827 (cell)

From: [Brent Gutmann](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Ballot Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:57:34 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

*All the Best, Kol Tuv,
Rabbi Brent Gutmann (he/him/his)
Senior Rabbi
Temple Kol Ami
5085 Walnut Lake Road
West Bloomfield, MI 48323
248-661-0040 x222
rabbigutmann@tkolami.org*

This e-mail communication is confidential and is intended only for the individual(s) or entity named above and others who have been specifically authorized to receive it. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy, use or disclose the contents of this communication to others. Please notify the sender that you have received this email in error by replying to the email or by telephoning 248-661-0040. Please then delete the email and any copies of it.

From: [Rena Basch](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: SECURE MI VOTE initiative - summary of purpose comments
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 10:33:34 AM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Hello,

I have read through the many proposed changes to Michigan Election Codes and MCLs in this initiative, and would like to submit for your consideration the following summary:

Legislation requiring all voters to show photo identification, no exceptions. Eliminates current right to sign affidavit of identity if voter does not have ID. Creates new "ID-only provisional ballot". Creates requirement that election results cannot be finalized until 6 days after election. Requires voter to provide personal identity info on every absent voter (AV) ballot application. Forbids use of donations, grants and in-kind contributions for elections, (e.g., forbids free use of churches or community centers for voting.) Bans election officials from sending AV applications; only allows PACs, political parties, candidates, NGO's etc. to send unsolicited AV applications.

Thank you,

--

Rena Basch
4260 Shetland Dr, Ann Arbor, MI 48105
734 276 5945

From: [Anne Sackrison](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Initiative
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:44:38 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I understand you are looking for public comment on your initiative. Your effort to place obstacles in the way of our votes is UNAMERICAN and deplorable. We stand united against your attack on democracy. We aren't going anywhere.

Respect the vote,

Anne Sackrison

Voter in Troy, MI

586-453-9067

4621 Mill Pond Dr, Troy, MI 48085

From: [Jessica Swartz](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Petition Summary
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 8:47:23 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear Board of Canvassers:

I am writing to note that I strongly disagree with the summary presented by Secure MI Vote as representing the contents of their petition. As written, the submitted summary would mislead signers. The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity." Moreover, it doesn't simply prohibit "special interest" funding -- it prohibits **all** private funding, including from local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers. (As a poll-worker, I can tell you we greatly appreciated the snacks that a local sorority provided to our polling location!) In fact, it may even prohibit schools or other areas from offering their space to be used for elections for no cost; thus, even further restricting voting access to only those with a 9-5 job and reliable transportation. It must be made clear that clerks rely on funding from many nonpartisan groups to run the secure elections we currently have. Eliminating this option -- in the absence of a tax increase to properly fund clerks - will actually make elections LESS secure.

The summary also must absolutely mention that the proposed language would actually **prohibit** election officials from sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested. As we saw in 2020, millions of people across the political spectrum took the opportunity provided to them with the applications to vote when they otherwise would not have. There is simply no valid reason for this prohibition. If an unregistered voter accidentally gets an application and returns it, the myriad other safeguards would ensure that person does not get a ballot. Notably, signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will not be on the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters. As written, many, many signers would agree to sign the petition thinking that the question should be put to a vote (which it should). The summary must very clearly educate voters that signing this petition will not make that happen.

I appreciate your time and attention to this matter.
Regards,
Jessica Swartz

From: [Kim](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Petition Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:59:51 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Board Members,

I am writing to encourage rejection of the Secure MI Vote petition summary. The summary does not accurately reflect the petition purpose. The summary is dishonest and disingenuous. The proposed legislation does not "protect the right to vote" or "increase confidence in the conduct of elections".

Photo identification is already required before casting a ballot. If photo id is not available, the voter is required to sign an affidavit, under penalty of perjury (punishable by up to \$1000 fine and/or up to five years imprisonment) for making a false statement.

The "free photo identification" is not free. The funds to pay for the "free id" are taken from taxpayer monies. The actual "free id" requires underlying documents which are not free of charge, i.e. birth certificate, marriage license, etc.

The petition summary is misleading when it states that it will "protect election integrity". Our elections are already safe and secure. Any "special interest funding" is used to support non-partisan endeavors that enhance voting for all citizens, i.e. ballot drop boxes, increasing hours for clerk offices, etc.

The Secure MI Vote petition summary does not accurately reflect the proposed petition or the results if this petition is adopted.

Please reject this summary.

Thank you,

Kim Peters
5643 Monterey
Haslett, MI 48840
peters-k1@sbcglobal.net

From: [Lou Porter](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:00:10 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Board of Canvassers:

The statement of purpose that is at the very top of the page, directly under the heading Initiation of Legislation is intentionally false and misleading and though supposedly addressing voter fraud is in fact constituting a fraud on the public. Here is the statement I am referring to:

"An initiation of legislation to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot, to increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote and to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections by amending Michigan Election Code sections 495, 523, 759, 759a, 759b, 761, 761b, and 813 (MCL 168.496, MCL 168.523, MCL 168.759, MCL 168.759a, MCL 168.759b, MCL 168.761b, MCL 168.764b, and MCL 168.813) and adding sections 523b (MCL 168.523b), 760a, MCL 168.750a and 946 (MCL 168.946)

The Legislation Does Not Protect the Right To Vote:

First, the proposed legislation does not protect the right to vote. It instead burdens the right to vote in multiple ways.

- It intentionally burdens the right to vote in multiple ways. First, it diminishes the sources of funding of elections without assuring that funding will be made available for secure drop boxes, election security, voting booths, polling places and training for election security. No mechanism is provided mandating that the legislature make up for funding secured or offered by outside donors in the last election. The absence of ready access to drop boxes burdens voters.
- It prohibits a voter from casting a ballot unless the voter not just possesses but a limited but specific form of identification but has it in their possession at the time the elector seeks to cast a ballot. Those individuals without the required limited and specific form of personal identification in their immediate possession at that time will be denied the right to vote, even though they are electors under the state constitution – unless they travel to the city or township clerk and present the required form of voter identification – severely burdening those voters .

- It does not provide that all existing registered voters will be provided those specific and limited forms of identification free of cost, thus disenfranchising all of those voters who do not apply for one of those limited but specific forms of identification. Having to separately apply for one of the specific and limited forms of identification with a photo identification burdens those electors who are effected by this new requirement.
- It prohibits election officials from sending applications for absent voter ballot applications unless the voter has specifically made a request for an absent voter ballot for that specific election – again burdening the voter and suppressing turnout.
- It imposes additional burdens by requiring identification before applying for an absent voter ballot. Again this is a burden – not a protection.

The Legislation Does Not Increase Confidence In The Conduct of Elections.

- Second, the proposed legislation does not increase confidence in the conduct of elections or the outcome of elections. There is no evidence that the past election was in any way tainted. The Senate's own report demonstrated that. All these proposals are a blatantly partisan effort at suppressing voter turnout among certain segments of the population in an effort to subvert the will of the electors under the state constitution by imposing additional burdens on voters.

The Legislation Does Not Protect Election Integrity by Prohibiting Special Interest Funding.

- Third, there is no evidence that donations by private parties to assure an adequate number of secure drop boxes, an adequate number of election workers, an adequate number of voting booths and machines in any way implicated the purity of elections. Unless the Legislature is required to fully make up that funding, then the proposed legislation damages election integrity by burdening the electorate for no reason whatsoever!

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Porter
State Bar Number P23116

From: [Susan Andress](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Proposed Petition Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:15:43 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

1. It is not clear that the petition if passed will never appear on the ballot but goes straight to law. That's 3.4% of the population.
2. Long legal codes at the end of the petition would take a week in the law library to decipher.
3. It does not protect against special interest funding, but bars nonpartisan groups and individuals from giving water or snacks to election workers.
4. I would prohibit sending absentee ballots unless formally requested. Many older voters, like myself, expect to get the application in the mail because we earlier requested to automatically get one.

From: [Faye Schuett](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:15:21 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I object to the deceptive language of the Secure MI Vote petition summary.

Most of the changes in MI laws that the summary is supposed to illuminate comes in a list of changes and additions to the Michigan Election Code. The list is deceptive because it does nothing to explain what the many changes and additions will actually do.

How is the voter supposed to guess what "amending Michigan Election Code sections 495, 523, 759, 759a, 761, 761b, and 813 (MCL 168.495, MCL 168.523, MCL 168.759, MCL 168.759a, MCL 168.756b, MCL 168.671, MCL 168.761b, MCL 168.764b, and MCL 168.813) and adding sections 523b (MCL 168,523b) 760a (MCL 168.760a) and 946 (MCL 168.946)" actually means?

This unexplained list is obviously not a summary of what is being proposed but a big blindfold behind which a voter cannot peek while trying to decide whether or not to sign the petition. The list is trying to pull a fast one.

Also, when the Secure MI Vote summary says its proposals will provide "free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote" the summary is being less than truthful.

Under the actual proposal, a registered voter who can't afford to pay for a state ID card needs to prove his or her hardship by filling out an undisclosed application for reimbursement. It may be possible for a poor voter to be reimbursed for a photo ID under this law, but that is not the same thing as offering "free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote."

The language of the summary makes it sound as if a free photo ID will be offered to any needy voter. Instead, a registered voter who can't afford to pay for a photo ID will need to prove his or her financial need. This sounds like punishment for being poor rather than an offer of a free service.

Faye Schuett
Farmington, MI

From: [Lisa S](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 7:22:21 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To Whom It May Concern:

The Secure MI Vote initiation of legislation summary leaves out the fact that voters would be required to send their personal data through the mail to get an absentee ballot, which they did not have to do before, making them vulnerable to identity theft.

Also, it leaves out the fact that the last 4 digits of the social would be required to register to vote. Voting has nothing to do with Social Security and putting these sensitive last four digits out there is EXTREMELY DANGEROUS FOR IDENTITY THEFT, especially for older people who tend to vote absentee. It has been proven that identity thieves can steal your ID if they have these last four digits because the first sets of numbers pertain to your birth location and group (year born), all of which is easy to find out. The fact that the last four digits of your social are the most sensitive part of your SS# is WELL KNOWN. This should NEVER be divulged or used to ID a person. There have been many articles on this over the years. It wasn't until 2011 that SS numbers became randomized.

The summary also does not mention that the petition unnecessarily prevents any government office from sending absentee ballot applications unsolicited.

As such, I urge you to reject this legislation. The summary is misleading (as I am sure the authors intended), and should not be allowed to go forth without clarification of language and facts.

Sincerely, Lisa Schwartz

From: [Smith, Stacey](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure MI Vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:38:46 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I am very against this initiative from the Michigan GOP intended to make voting harder and create more voter suppression. This stems from all of the ridiculous claims of voter fraud in the last election.

The goal of everyone should be to make voting easier and more widely accessible, not less. Shame on the Michigan republicans. Let everyone vote!!

Stacey Smith
[Novi, MI 48377](#)

The information transmitted by this email is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. This email may contain proprietary, business-confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, be aware that any use, review, retransmission, distribution, reproduction or any action taken in reliance upon this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers.

From: [Alan Ells](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure Michigan Vote Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:52:15 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear Sir or Madam:

I was a poll watcher during the last election in 2020. That election, held during a pandemic, was the safest and one of the largest voter turnouts in state history. I am submitting the following comments on the Secure Michigan Vote summary.

1. The summary does not inform potential signers that the petition will NOT result in a referendum to be voted on, but rather a bill to be passed by the state legislator that can not be vetoed by the Governor.
2. The Summary misleads potential signers as it doesn't protect the right to vote but impedes access to the ballot box through unnecessary duplicative and time consuming application procedures..
3. Poll watchers should be neutral supporters of the election process, even if selected by a political party. Attempts to insert partisan challenges to voting defeats democracy.
4. The Summary does not state that access to absentee ballots will be restricted during the ongoing pandemic. This disproportionately affects the elderly, the disabled, and those who must take public transportation to the polls or clerk's office.

Very truly yours,

Alan Ells, PLLC
Attorney at law

POB 6625
Saginaw MI 48608

From: [Amy Mindell](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: secure mivote summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:26:49 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

To Whom It May Concern:

I object to this misleading summary. For one, signers do not know this will be directly adopted by the legislature with just 3.4% of Michigander's signatures. Second, the content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity." Finally, the summary does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, which is a striking new policy which should have a full public hearing.

Please do not approve this summary as it now stands.

Thank you.

Amy Mindell

West Bloomfield, MI

--

From: [Pamela Merrick](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Secure my vote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:57:41 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear sirs and madame's

I am writing this to let you know the " secure my Vote initiative"
Does not speak for the majority in our state nor is it about making our vote safe.It is about
obstructing our vote to keep the current people In power .
We protest the work arounds, and other dirty business they are about
In order to stay in power
Hope you are aware what they are up to
And I am taking a stand against it!

Regards
Pamela Merrick

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [T. McCormick](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: SecureMI Vote petition comment
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:45:23 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Dear BOC,

I strongly object to the drafted language on the SecureMI Vote petition summary. The language used seems benign to a casual reader/potential signer, but does not at all represent what is in the petition language. This summary language is intentionally designed to dupe the casual reader on the street.

The content of this petition in fact clearly does not "protect the right to vote" or "increase confidence in elections", as stated in the summary. This language cannot stand.

A suggestion that fairly and honestly summarizes the content of the petition:

"An initiation of legislation to broadly amend twelve sections of the Michigan Election Code, including significantly increasing the amount of identification required to vote, limiting absentee ballot applications, decrease processing time for city clerks, and removing local funding for election processes, by amending..."

Thank you for your time and attention to this critical matter before you.

Terri McCormick
2360 Highbury Dr.
Troy, MI 48085

From: [lee schottenfels](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: SecureMIVote petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:40:05 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Canvassers,

Please hear my total objection to the language in the petition that you are considering today. It is totally misleading!!

It does not "protect our right to vote." Nor does it prohibit "special interest" funding alone.

The people voted for a better voting system. This petition will eliminate the voted rights of Michigan citizens

Please consider!

Lee Schottenfels
4152wendell
W. Bloomfield, MI 48323

--

Lee

From: [Dave Lester](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Statewide Ballot proposal
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:17:47 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I oppose this language requiring expanding voter identification for absentee ballots. This is a voter suppression measure, and not needed, since no voter fraud has been found. Further ID requirement is a burden and a security risk for a person's personal information.

--

Dave Lester
535 Springfield Street
Comstock Park, MI 49321
Cell 616-304-3380

From: [Kathy Curell](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Summary from securemivote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:40:04 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Michigan State Board of Canvassers,

I object to the summary proposed by Secure Mi Vote. I am hoping you will not allow this petition to go forward. The petition does not protect the right to vote, or protect election security. The summary is deceptive. It fails to mention that the petition would require voters to include the last four digits of their Social Security number on a absentee voting application or to register to vote. It is deceptive by proclaiming that it will limit special interest funding. Instead, it would prevent local non-partisan community groups from helping local election officials and volunteers from some thing as simple as snacks for election workers. It would prevent election officials from sending out unsolicited absentee ballot applications. Access to the ballot should be protected for all of our citizens, regardless of their socioeconomic status.

What the petition will do if successful is allow the opinion of 3.4% of Michigan population to enact restrictions on voting without the approval of the Governor or the voters.

Thank you
Kathleen
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Meg Dupuis](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Summary Language for Secure MI Vote Petition
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 4:14:48 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

Hello,

I am writing to express my objection to the misleading language in the summary of the Secure MI Vote petition.

The proposed summary fails to mention that election officials would be prohibited from sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested.

The proposed summary also does not inform people signing the petition that this petition would never go before Michigan voters. Rather, it would go directly to the legislature with signatures from only 3.4% of Michigan's population and without the approval of voters or the governor.

I am writing to ask you to reject the proposed language of the summary of the Secure MI Vote petition.

Thank you.

Margaret Dupuis
Kalamazoo

From: [Kelly Bailey](#)
To: [MDOS-Carvassers](#)
Subject: Summary of secureMiVote
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:17:36 PM

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

I find the summary submitted by secureMiVote to be very misleading and encourage you to dismiss it as such. Specifically, the claims I find misleading are: the petition doesn't protect the right to vote, it doesn't increase confidence in the conduction of elections, it doesn't prohibit private funding and most importantly, makes no mention of anything relating to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot APPLICATIONS (not actual ballots) out unless requested. So anyone signing the petition wouldn't know that that could no longer happen. This is voter suppression at its worst and very unamerican. Please ensure the the people of Michigan sign petitions because they believe in something and not because they've been mislead.

Kelly Bailey
5355 Pleasant Lake Dr, West Bloomfield Township, MI 48322

From: [Barry Rubin](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:00:03 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

The summary submitted for the SecureMiVote petition summary is totally misleading.

- The content of the petition does not "protect the right to vote", "increase confidence in the conduct of elections", or "protect election integrity."
- It doesn't prohibit "special interest" funding -- it actually prohibits all private funding, including local nonpartisan community groups who might want to provide something as simple as snacks for election workers.
- It also does not mention anything related to the prohibition of election officials sending absentee ballot applications unless formally requested, so signers would not have any indication of this.

Signers also have no way of knowing that this initiative will never go to the ballot, but is intended to be directly adopted by the legislature with signatures from just 3.4% of Michigan's population and without approval of the governor or the voters.

Barry Rubin

Barry Rubin
2602 Peterboro Court
West Bloomfield, Michigan 48323
248-737-0852 (home)
248-701-7414 (cell)

From: [Kathryn Bell](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Voter suppression
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:20:50 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I oppose any attempt to restrict the ability of voters to engage in their right to vote. Our system is secure already. The Republican ploy is an attempt to suppress the voice of Michigan citizens by making voting restrictive and difficult. I object vehemently to the partisan plot and will use the power of my voice and vote to work to preserve voting access.

This is a ridiculous, time-wasting, harmful effort by Republicans to try and retain power without doing anything constructive to serve the citizens of Michigan.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Nancy Wang](#)
To: [MDOS-Canvassers](#)
Subject: Voters Not Politicians" Objections to Secure MI Vote Petition Summary
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:35:17 PM
Attachments: [2021-09-09 VNP objections to SMV summary letterhead final.pdf](#)

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to
abuse@michigan.gov**

On behalf of Voters Not Politicians, please accept the attached objections and proposed alternate summary.

Thank you!

--

Nancy M. Wang

Executive Director Voters Not Politicians

m: 415-823-0576

w: www.votersnotpoliticians.com



September 9, 2021

Jonathan Brater
Director of Elections
Richard H. Austin Building
430 W. Allegan 1st Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48918

Re: Objections to Secure MI Vote Petition Summary

Dear Director Brater:

On behalf of the Voters Not Politicians Ballot Committee (Voters Not Politicians or VNP), I write to object to the Petition Summary submitted by "Secure MI Vote" and to propose alternate language for your consideration.

Voters Not Politicians is a nonpartisan organization that works to strengthen democracy by engaging people across Michigan in effective citizen action. VNP sponsored the voter-initiated ballot proposal to amend the Michigan Constitution to create Michigan's Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission, which was approved overwhelmingly by the voters in 2018. VNP has a continuing interest in protecting the People's right to propose beneficial changes by voter initiative. We write today to protect against the misuse of the process by Secure MI Vote.

As you know, MCL 168.482b(1)(b) requires a petition summary to be a "true and impartial statement of the purpose of the proposed amendment...in language that does not create prejudice for or against the proposed amendment...."

The Petition Summary proposed by Secure MI Vote, however, reads like a campaign mailer and fails to satisfy these requirements. **Nearly every representation the summary makes about what the current law is, and what the petition would do, is untrue and/or not impartial.**

- First, the clause "to protect the right to vote and increase confidence in the conduct of elections by requiring photo identification before casting a ballot" suggests that a photo ID is not needed currently -- that is **not true**. Michigan Election Law already requires photo ID to cast a ballot. MCL 168.523(1). The amendments that the sponsor proposes would make it more difficult for a person who arrives to vote without the required photo identification, but the

underlying photo identification requirement already exists. Additionally, the assertion that the proposed amendment, which would clearly make it more difficult for people to vote, would “protect the right to vote” is disingenuous and **not impartial**. Likewise, whether such changes to the process would “increase confidence in elections” is at best a matter of opinion that is strongly disputed, and is **not impartial** at all.

- The clause to “increase participation by providing free photo identification to anyone needing it to vote” is also **absurd**. The purpose of the amendments is clearly to decrease voter participation by making it more difficult for those who may not have identification or forget to bring it on Election Day. In addition, a person can obtain photo identification for free right now. Finally, the reason why someone might need to obtain this new form of identification, which is created solely to make it more onerous for people to vote, is never even explained in the Petition Summary.
- The last clause “to protect election integrity by prohibiting special interest funding of elections” also has no business being in the Petition Summary. The proposed amendments would eliminate all private funding, including for voter registration and election security. Moreover, the term “special interest” is not defined, is a matter of opinion, and is a **misleadingly narrow** description of what the amendments would actually prohibit.
- Finally, the Petition Summary **fails to explain what the proposed amendments would actually do**, including to fundamentally change the process required for persons who do not have photo identification, by not allowing them to vote a regular ballot, not allowing their ballot to be counted on election day and requiring them to go to a clerk’s office within 6 days after the election with certain specified forms of identification in order to have their vote ever be counted. Moreover, absentee ballot applications cannot be just sent to people, which obviously makes voting easier and more accessible, nor can they even be provided online absent a specific request. Local clerks would also be given access to highly personal sensitive information for all voters in their area, including social security and driver’s license numbers, without any protection or safeguards. A person cannot even register to vote without providing the last four digits of their social security number.

Paid for with regulated funds by Voters Not Politicians Ballot Committee,
P.O. Box 13099, Lansing MI 48901

For all of the foregoing reasons, we ask that you prepare a completely new summary of the Secure MI Vote petition that is in fact “true and impartial” as required by law. For your consideration, we attach a proposed petition summary that we believe more accurately and objectively describes the proposed amendments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'NW', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nancy Wang
Executive Director

Encl.: Proposed Petition Summary

Paid for with regulated funds by Voters Not Politicians Ballot Committee,
P.O. Box 13099, Lansing MI 48901

Proposed Petition Summary

An initiation of legislation to amend the Michigan Election Law to: (i) require voters without photo ID to vote provisional ballots not counted on election day; (ii) require such voters to bring acceptable ID to the clerk's office within 6 days to have their vote counted; (iii) require personally identifiable information on absentee ballot and registration applications; (iv) prohibit election officials from sending or providing online absentee ballot applications without receiving a specific request; (v) provide social security and driver's license information to all local clerks without safeguards; and (vi) prohibit the use of non-taxpayer funding sources, including for voter registration and election security.

Paid for with regulated funds by Voters Not Politicians Ballot Committee,
P.O. Box 13099, Lansing MI 48901